FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Geneva Delegation To Make 'Major Proposal' on Arms AA 1
Bogachev Criticizes Kampelman on Arms 'Obstacles' AA 1
Vorontsov Eyes U.S., Soviet Views on Missile Issue AA 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Interviewed by Indonesian Paper MERDEKA [PRAVDA 23 Jul] CC 1
U.S. Comment on Interview CC 10
U.S. Escort of Tankers Seen as 'Unsupportable' [IZVESTIYA 23 Jul] CC 11
'Top Priority' Program Views Disarmament Talks [Pozner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov] CC 12
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events [19 Jul] CC 17
Delegation Head Interviewed on ECOSOC Session [IZVESTIYA 15 Jul] CC 21
Foreign Military Attaches Take Trip to Minsk [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul] CC 23

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S.-Japan SDI Accords Point to 'Open Hypocrisy' A 1

CHINA

PRC, USSR Announce 2d Round of Border Talks B 1
Chairmen of USSR-PRC Friendship Societies Meet B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Nakasone Welcomes Gorbachev Disarmament Offer C 1
TASS Cites KYODO Comments C 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Australia Contributed to Soviet Arms Proposal [Melbourne] D 1
Gusev Exchanges Opinions With Cambodia's Hun Sen D 1
Laotian Party Delegation Ends USSR Visit [PRAVDA 21 Jul] D 1

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

- Commentators Assess U.S. Role in Persian Gulf E 1
  - Shabayev on 'Obsolete Dogmas' E 1
  - Levin Cites 'Saber-Rattling' E 2
  - Agayants Assails 'Provocation' E 3
  - Gavrilov Chides 'Cowboy-Style' E 4
    [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Jul]
- Iranian Envoy in UK Labels Moves 'Provocation' E 5
- Iraq Supports UN Resolution on Gulf Cease-Fire E 5
- Kornilov Condemns UK Support for Afghan Rebels E 6
- Anti-Soviet Campaign in Pakistani Press Reported E 6
- Supreme Soviet Delegation in Algeria for Fete E 7
  - Meets With Chairman Bitat E 7
  - Received, Greeted by Leaders E 7
    [IZVESTIYA 6 Jul]
  - Seen Off at Visit's Conclusion E 8
    [PRAVDA 9 Jul]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

- Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in Zaire F 1
  [Kinshasa AZAP]
- Mozambique's Chissano To Visit USSR 3-6 August F 1

EAST EUROPE

- CPCZ Zavadil Begins Visit, Meets Union Leaders G 1
  - Prague Reports Moscow Arrival G 1
  - Meets Shalayev, Medvedev [Prague] G 1
- TASS Cites PPR Spokesman on U.S. Aid to Solidarity G 1
- PPR's Wozniak Writes Article on Economic Reform G 2
  [EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA Jul 87]

WEST EUROPE

- Britain Makes Statement on Weapons Use in Gulf H 1
- UK Support of U.S. Gulf Policy Criticized H 1
  [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jul]
- U.S. Claims of Greek Links With Terrorism Denied H 2
  [PRAVDA 8 Jul]
- Commerce Minister Signs Agreement With USSR H 3
  [cross-reference]
- FRG's Woerner Plans Missile 'Modernization' H 3
  [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jul]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

- Mexican Senate Delegation Visits Supreme Soviet I 1
  [Mexico City EL DIA 8 Jul]
- CPSU Delegation Received by Brazilian Senator I 2
  [IZVESTIYA 19 Jul]
- Briefs: New Ambassador to Colombia I 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL

CPSU Central Committee Criticizes Kuybyshev Oblast R 1
Khitrun Elected Ryazan Obkom First Secretary R 1
Shcherbitskiy Attends Kiev Obkom Plenum R 1
PRAVDA Cites Criticism of Ukraine 'Upper Echelon' [18 Jul] R 2
Dissident Skobov Reportedly Freed in Leningrad [AFP] R 4
Author Akhmetov Expected To Immigrate to West [DPA] R 5
Court Backs Union Against Plant Director [Petrunya] R 5
Lukyanov Addresses Constitutional Conference [MOSCOW NEWS 19 Jul] R 6
Writer: Openness Must Apply to History Too [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 4 Jul] R 10
Moscow Seminar Hits 'Dogmatizing' of History [MOSCOW NEWS 19 Jul] R 16
Impact of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA Column Viewed [IZVESTIYA 17 Jul] R 19
F. Burlatskiy Hits Opponents of Restructuring [PRAVDA 18 Jul] R 21
Archives Head on WWII Document Declassification [IZVESTIYA 20 Jul] R 25
Nearly 1,000 Reportedly Sacked From Kazakh Police [AFP] R 27
Briefs: Sverdlovsk Airport Upgraded R 27

ECONOMIC

Abalkin Discusses Reform, Socialist Dialectics [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jul] S 1

AGRICULTURAL

Equipment Shortfalls Hamper Harvesting Work [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Jul] T 1
CSA Reports Harvesting Figures for 20 July T 2

MILITARY

Radar Unit's 'Shoddy Work' Criticized [Rodionov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jul] V 1

GENEVA DELEGATION TO MAKE 'MAJOR PROPOSAL' ON ARMS

LD230728 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] At the request of the Soviet Union a full-scale session is to be convened today at the Geneva talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear and space weapons. The Soviet delegation, its spokesman says, intends to make a major proposal. The proposal is based on Mikhail Gorbachev's idea of a global zero-zero option, that is, scrapping by the Soviet Union and the United States all their medium-range and tactical missiles.

BOGACHEV CRITICIZES KAMPELMAN ON ARMS 'OBSTACLES'

LD230834 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1930 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation to the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons, maintains that the United States is invariably maintaining the position worked out in 1981 when Soviet-U.S. negotiations on medium-range nuclear forces in Europe began. Without denying that new obstacles have arisen on the way to attaining agreements on medium-range missiles, the U.S. diplomat insists that they all arose not because of changes in Washington's position, not because of the U.S. departure from previously agreed approaches, but by virtue of an "inexplicable Soviet decision to play for time."

In an article, "Answer to Moscow on Medium-Range Nuclear Forces Negotiations," published in THE NEW YORK TIMES, Kampelman appraises in a highly original manner the "new obstacles" to the attainment of an agreement and even fabricates problems that just do not exist.

"In the 5 years of negotiations the Soviets did not once propose to limit the German Pershing missiles or their warheads. Now, when an agreement is within reach, this demand is suddenly put forward. Who, it may be asked, is creating obstacles to an agreement at the last minute?"

Unfortunately, this statement by Kampelman is full of inaccuracies, incomplete presentations, and half-truths. He is right only in that the Soviet Union really did not previously suggest "limiting the German missiles." Yet, for some reason, Kampelman does not spell out that, even now, the Soviet side is not putting forward any such demand. Needless to say, the U.S. diplomat did not cite, nor could he cite, any Soviet proposals about "third-party" missiles. His statement can be seen as a deliberate attempt to mislead the readers of THE NEW YORK TIMES.

Kampelman feigns "amazement" at the USSR's "unexpected" demand for the elimination of all U.S. nuclear warheads for operational and tactical missiles, including those of the FRG. Yet there is nothing here to be amazed about. The point is that prior to this spring missiles with the range of less than 1,000 km belonging to the USSR and the United States and the nuclear charges for them were simply not to be discussed, in accordance with the mandate for the talks. During the 5 years referred to by Kampelman the talking was about medium-range missiles.

When the question of operational and tactical missiles (in the United States they prefer to call them shorter medium-range missiles) was raised at Geneva on the initiative of the United States and other NATO countries, the problem of eliminating all Soviet and U.S. nuclear charges for them also arose. It was then that the Soviet Union asked what was to happen to the U.S. warheads for the FRG's Pershings too. Incidentally, the West German Pershing-1A's are "dual-purpose" delivery vehicles. They can also take nonnuclear warheads. The elimination of the U.S. nuclear warheads does not mean that the FRG's missiles will become "powerless."

Needless to say, Kampelman knows the whole history of this issue. There is the suspicion that the head of the U.S. delegation in Geneva is deliberately distorting the facts to muddy the waters, to abandon his own proposals on weapons with a range of less than 1,000 km, and ultimately to retain U.S. nuclear charges for the Pershing-1 missiles. Incidentally, such delivery vehicles exist not only in the FRG but also in the United States (108 units).

Even more rational are Kampelman's "arguments" supporting the U.S. intention to convert the U.S. Pershing-2's into Pershing-1B missiles, and the U.S. land-based cruise missiles into sea-based ones. Yet it is precisely on this issue that the true aims of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks are most clearly revealed. Washington, contrary to the previous assurances of President Ronald Reagan, has no desire to "destroy the whole class of medium-range nuclear arms." The present U.S. Administration is willing, at most, merely to replace one set of weapons of mass destruction with others no less dangerous.

It is noticeable that Kampelman did not explain what he meant when he proposed that the treaty should allow both sides to convert their medium-range nuclear weapons to other classes of systems rather than destroying them. Surely he is not advising the Soviet Union to convert its SS-20 medium missiles [sredniye rakety] into SS-16 strategic delivery vehicles [sredstva dostavki] in the conditions created by the scrapping by the United States of SALT II, which banned intercontinental missiles of this class?

Kampelman began his NEW YORK TIMES article with assurances that the United States remains loyal to its unchanging principles of honest disarmament. All his subsequent propositions and arguments, however, in defense of rearmament [perevooruzheniye], rebut that thesis, including the description of the U.S. proposals in Geneva as "an honest and balanced considering the rights and interests of both sides."

It ought to be noted that the United States is still unable to give an intelligible explanation of how the retention of 72 U.S. nuclear warheads can be reconciled with Washington's concept of a global "double zero."

VORONTSOV EYES U.S., SOVIET VIEWS ON MISSILE ISSUE

LD221303 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1147 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- The Soviet Union and the United States are close to reaching agreement on the destruction of medium- and reduced-range missiles in Europe, Yuriy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, writes in the latest issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI.

In April, the Soviet Union submitted fresh initiatives on problems the U.S. side claimed were hampering agreement. This gave the talks a fresh impulse. But now this impulse is quite obviously under threat: the U.S. side is trying to introduce into the accord reached at Reykjavik new conditions that act as a brake on the road to agreement.

The United States, in particular, is insisting on including in the treaty a provision about its right to turn its Pershing-2 missiles into Pershing-1B missiles with a lower range, rather than dismantle them totally. The problem, however, is that the Pershing-1B missiles can be transformed into Pershing-2 missiles in only 2 days. Nor does the United States want to destroy another class of medium-range weapons deployed [razmeshchennykh] in Europe, that is, cruise missiles.

Another important problem is the current U.S. proposal to the effect that at the first stage of the agreement the Soviet Union should unilaterally reduce and dismantle its missiles, moreover under U.S. supervision. At the same time, the U.S. arsenal would be kept untouched, and Soviet inspectors would not be allowed on the U.S. bases, the article says.

From the Soviet view all medium-range missiles in Europe should be destroyed. We are ready for a "global zero option" on the condition that U.S. nuclear weapons in the Far East, including weapons deployed [razmeshchennoye] in Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea are counted, and that U.S. aircraft-carrier forces in the Pacific Ocean are removed to defined agreed limits, Vorontsov writes.

GORBACHEV INTERVIEWED BY INDONESIAN PAPER MERDEKA

PM231151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 87 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with M.S. Gorbachev by Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA correspondent B.M. Diah; TASS report headlines: "Answers by M.S. Gorbachev to Questions From the Indonesian Newspaper MERDEKA"; 21 July in the Kremlin; first two paragraphs PRAVDA introduction -- passages within slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] On 21 July, M.S. Gorbachev received B.M. Diah, publisher and chief editor of the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA, in the Kremlin and answered questions from that newspaper.

An animated conversation took place between M.S. Gorbachev and B.M. Diah, the contents of which are cited hereunder.

M.S. Gorbachev. I am pleased to meet you, Mr Diah. I have heard a lot about your activity. After all, you have been engaged in journalism for some decades now.

B.M. Diah. I am fortunate to meet with you, Mr General Secretary. This is a great honor for me. I have, in fact, been working in the world of journalism for 50 years now.

M.S. Gorbachev. That's a substantial amount of experience. Experience is not a dead weight, especially if it is used correctly. So, we are now tackling new tasks in our country. At this stage of development we are constantly enriching ourselves on the basis of the experience and lessons of history.

B.M. Diah. We devote a very great deal of attention to your utterances and to those processes which are taking place in the Soviet Union.

M.S. Gorbachev. Thank you. Have our words "glasnost" and "perestroyka" reached you? Are they translated into the Indonesian language?

B.M. Diah. Those words are well known at home and need no translation.

M.S. Gorbachev. I should like to convey to you my written replies to your questions and to preface them with some brief, but, I think, essential observations. I am grateful to you and to your newspaper's editorial office for the fact that you have drawn attention to the forthcoming anniversary of my Vladivostok speech. The Soviet leadership attaches important significance to what was said in Vladivostok. We tried at that time to expound our policy vis-a-vis an enormous region -- a region where hundreds of millions of people reside. In so doing, we were counting on our policy's encountering the relevant comprehension.

I regard the questions you have addressed to me as evidence of the fact that in Indonesian society there is an interest in our policy, in our assessments of the state of affairs in the Asian-Pacific region, and in our reflections about the future of this region in the context of world politics.

In this regard, my comments amount to the following.

We have tried to look at the modern world from strictly scientific and realistic stances. The analysis made led us to a new vision of the world and to the new policy, which we have proclaimed at our party congress.

The analysis also helped us to see those realities that characterize the present world. And it differs substantially from how it was 30-40 years ago.

Above all, in connection with the accumulation of enormous stocks of nuclear weapons, human civilization has found itself in jeopardy. This is a reality that has to be reckoned with. Moreover, the correct evaluation of this reality leads to the conclusion that it is impossible today to resolve problems of world politics militarily. Such a path would be fraught with unpredictable consequences. This means that it is necessary to make adjustments to views of the world and to the policy of states.

The problems existing in the world require the pooling of efforts of all countries. In general, if one looks at the progress of science and technology, it is bringing us ever more closely together and is linking us more closely than every. We are increasingly dependent on each other and we are becoming essential to one another.

B.M. Diah. As I recall, you expressed this very idea in your speech in Vladivostok.

M.S. Gorbachev. That's precisely what I would like to say -- that we based our Vladivostok speech on our views of the modern world.

I deliberately did not mention this at the beginning of our conversation in order to build a bridge to the next part of our reflections. I mean that one of the realities of this world is the emergence into the international arena of dozens of states which have embarked on the path of self-reliant, independent development. This is an enormous world with its own enormous interests and with an accumulation of major problems.

B.M. Diah. I am fortunate to hear at first hand about what you spoke of during your official visit to India, at the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity, "and in your speech at Vladivostok.

M.S. Gorbachev. I think that it is important to talk about these things until such time not only when they firmly sink into the minds of politicians but also find reflection in the actual politicy of states. The point is that at the present time it is impossible to build international relations without taking into consideration the interests of all states. There must be a balance of interests. Only that will lead to a sensible policy. And that is what I wanted to say in the Vladivostok speech.

B.M. Diah. It seems to me that you taught the world another lesson in Vladivostok. You emphasized that the Soviet Union is not capable of solving all these problems on its own. A contribution has to be made by other Asian states, including China, India, Indonesia, and other countries. I believe that this a very accurate and subtle [tonkiy] remark.

M.S. Gorbachev. I indeed welcome this appraisal you have made of that statement. We ask for nothing more than, together with all states in the Asian and Pacific region, to build new international relations which would be in line with the realities of the contemporary world.

Actually, when you listed the states in the region, you failed to mention the United States. We are hoping for cooperation with that country as well. Even though time and again we hear from the United States arguments to the effect that the USSR is supposedly making efforts that are a threat to countries in this region. But this is absurd. We invite all states -- and this was said in Vladivostok -- to cooperate in the Asian and Pacific region in the interests of peace and mutual understanding.

In reply to your questions, I have tried to dispel all suspicions regarding the Soviet Union's policy in this direction. We strive for cooperation with states in this region, and I have introduced new specific proposals in my replies by way of confirmation of these words and of our political statements. There is, in particular, a statement about the major step of eliminating all our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the USSR -- on the basis, of course, of a "global zero" with the United States.

I feel that my intention to limit myself to just a few brief remarks is turning into a second interview.

B.M. Diah. We are sincerely pleased with this meeting, Mr General Secretary. For me personally, it somehow crowns my 50 years of work as journalist.

M.S. Gorbachev. Thank you. I am pleased to have taken part in this coronation ceremony. (Animation)

B.M. Diah. There is one more question I would like to ask you. Within the framework of the ideas expressed by you in Vladivostok, is there any chance of your ever coming to Indonesia?

M.S. Gorbachev. Our relations with Indonesia are long established. They have developed their traditions. There have been, of course, ebbs and flows. But we cherish ties with Indonesia. Let us hope that the progress achieved in our relations in the recent past will grow. This will require contacts, including contacts at the political level, of course. They will probably be not only possible but also necessary. For the time being, we are awaiting a visit by the president of Indonesia.

B.M. Diah. I am sincerely grateful to you for this meeting and for your replies.

M.S. Gorbachev. Thank you for collaboration. I wish you a fruitful and interesting stay in our country. Until we meet again!

Question: We are coming up to the anniversary of your speech in Vladivostok, in which you put forward broad proposals for the strengthening of peace and security in the Asian and Pacific region. Many events have taken place in this vast region since then. Do you perceive any positive trends in their development?

Answer: I can answer immediately -- yes, I do.

The year that has elapsed and the main events during that year, including our talks with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, convinced us even more of the correctness and timeliness of raising the questions of security in the Asian and Pacific region. Our approach toward the quest for their solution -- being open to a democratic discussion of any ideas and proposals -- has also proved correct.

What does a look back over the year show us? The antinuclear composition of the overall picture stands out, despite the whole complexity and diversity of the Asian and Pacific scene, despite all the hues in the distribution of light and dark tones.

Here are some of its features: The South Pacific forum elaborated the Rarotonga Treaty. Indonesia is actively promoting the concept of a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. Australia and New Zealand are firmly opposed to French nuclear tests in the South Pacific and enjoy the support of the world's broad public. There are growing demands to rid the Korean peninsula of nuclear weapons. Municipalities and cities in many countries proclaim themselves nuclear-free regions. There are cases of entire states taking this stance. The Philippines and several others have included antinuclear provisions in their basic laws. The PRC is more and more actively speaking out on disarmament problems.

In connection with the USSR-U.S. talks, Asian countries have expressed interest in the complete elimination of medium-range missiles not only in Europe but also in Asia. They are examining this question in the context of their own national security.

The Soviet leadership has adopted an entirely serious and responsible attitude toward these wishes.

Now I am in a position to announce: The Soviet Union, moving in the direction of the Asian countries and taking into account their concern, is prepared to embark on the destruction of /all its medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the country too/; in other words, it is prepared to dispense with the question of retaining the 100 warheads on medium-range missiles which are the subject of discussion with the Americans at the Geneva talks -- on condition, of course, that the United States does exactly the same. Operational and tactical missiles also will be eliminated.

In other words, we will proceed from the concept of "global double zero."

In this case, we do not link this initiative with the U.S. nuclear presence in Korea, the Philippines, and the island of Diego Garcia. But we would like to hope that there will be no buildup of this presence.

Question: We know that negative trends are also developing in the Asian and Pacific region. What could you say about them?

Answer: I have already said a few things. Complications and contradictions have not diminished; there is a growing trend toward confrontation, and any signs of settlement of regional conflicts are still weak. The conflict in the Persian Gulf is even growing more exacerbated.

In my Vladivostok speech, I identified the causes of this, and listed specific sore points which create a permanent danger.

Further, we now have to add the refusal by the United States, Britain, and France to accede to the Rarotonga Treaty and the U.S. "warnings" to states that are unwilling to put up with nuclear weapons on their territories or off their shores.

Question: What measures to lessen tension in Asia and the Pacific do you consider the most pressing and practicable?

Answer: First and foremost, it is necessary again and again to talk about nuclear weapons.

Some 18 months ago we put forward a program for the phased, total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere by the year 2000. On this basis a conceptual breakthrough was possible at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik. For the first time people saw a prospect for a nuclear-free world.

They tried to block it. We did not agree to that. We put forward additional initiatives, which made it possible to transfer the preparation of an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles onto a practical footing.

I have just announced our new step relating directly to the Asian and Pacific region.

I also will mention certain other possible measures.

First. The Soviet Union is prepared to take on a pledge not to increase the number of nuclear-capable aircraft in the Asian part of the country, provided the United States does not station additional nuclear systems here that are capable of reaching the USSR's territory.

Second. Once again, I remind you of our readiness to lessen the activeness of the USSR and U.S. Navies in the Pacific Ocean. I spoke of this in Vladivostok. But the United States has given no reply. Yet it is obvious that the border of confrontation here runs through the proximity of the fleets. Hence the danger of conflicts.

It would be possible to agree to limit the areas of navigation by ships carrying nuclear weapons in such a way that they could not approach the coast of any side to within the range of operation of their on-board nuclear systems.

It would be possible to agree to limit antisubmarine rivalry and to ban antisubmarine activity, including aircraft activity, within specified zones.

Confidence-building would be promoted by limiting the scale of naval exercises and maneuvers in the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the adjacent seas: not more than one or two major naval (including naval aviation) exercises or maneuvers a year, notification of them in good time, and the mutual renunciation of naval exercises and maneuvers in international straits and the adjacent regions and of the use of combat weapons in the zones of traditional sea routes in the course of exercises.

It would be possible to try out this "model" first in the northern Pacific, where there are not many "dramatis personae." And then to extend this practice to the southern part of the Pacific sea area and other countries in the region.

Third. The UN declaration on transforming the Indian Ocean into a peace zone was adopted more than 15 years ago. Preparations have been under way for some years now for convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean, under UN auspices. It is now scheduled for 1988. But there is still no certainty that it will take place, because experience shows that as soon as there is any progress here, Washington breaks off the talks.

It is time to create international guarantees for the security of shipping in the Indian Ocean and in the seas, straits, and gulfs which make it up. There is also the question of the security of air communications. This too can be resolved, given the political will. The question of collective measures against terrorism on sea and air routes in the Indian Ocean remains pressing.

In a word, much that is useful could be done to strengthen security in the Indian Ocean.

Fourth: The question of nuclear explosions is particularly important. Mankind has not forgotten that the first U.S. atomic weapon tests after the war took place in the Pacific. They took away the health and even the lives of many inhabitants of these localities. We understand why there are such powerful feelings of indigation here about the refusal of the United States, Britain, and France to stop nuclear explosions.

We value the support of the Asian and Pacific countries for the Soviet moratorium. We have not stopped fighting for a nuclear test ban, and we will persistently seek a full-scale agreement.

We greatly value collaboration with the countries of the Asian and Pacific region, which are taking part in the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The question of the banning and elimination of chemical weapons is at a decisive stage at that conference now. We hope that by joint efforts we will be able to draw up and adopt a historic convention, which, I am convinced, also will stimulate progress along the paths to nuclear disarmament.

Other measures also are clearly possible to lessen military tension in the Asian and Pacific region, measures originating in the countries of the region themselves. The particular features of their philosophy and their political and cultural uniqueness also could suggest unusual ideas on this score that are comprehensible and acceptable to everyone.

Question: In the Vladivostok speech you voiced the idea of convening -- albeit as a distant goal -- a Pacific conference with the participation of all countries oriented toward the ocean, on the model of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The reaction to this idea in Asia and in the Pacific countries was mixed. What is your approach to this question now?

Answer: I spoke of this in Vladivostok as a kind of working hypothesis, or, more accurately, an invitation to discussion. I only referred to Helsinki because as yet the world community has no other experience of this kind. This does not mean, of course, that the European experience can automatically be transplanted to Asian and Pacific soil.

Nowadays, however, any international experiment has pan-human and global features. That is only natural, because we are living in an interdependent and in many respects an integrated world.

Take the Delhi Declaration on the principles of a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. This is a completely new example of a political-philosophical approach to the fundamental problems of interstate contacts. This document goes far beyond bilateral and regional frameworks -- it expresses the aspirations of all mankind, even though it is the result of the development of relations between two countries.

Relations between India and the USSR may be termed exemplary in many senses -- in being filled with diverse political, economic, scientific and technical, and cultural content, in profound mutual respect and sympathy between the two countries' peoples, and in their tone, which reflects reciprocal trust combined with a profound mutual need for friendship.

Why have relations of such a high caliber been able to develop between India and the Soviet Union, states with different sociopolitical systems? Because both sides -- not in words but in deeds -- base their policy on the principles of sovereignty, equality of rights, noninterference in internal affairs, cooperation, and the recognition of each people's freedom to choose its own political system and own forms of social development.

For that very reason we also say with a sense of pride that the Soviet Union and India are creating such a valuable model of interstate relations that they may be an attractive model for others.

The Indian festival now being held in the USSR, which is unique in its scale and which is imbued with the ideals of peace and goodness, just like the upcoming Soviet festival in India, embodies the present and the future of just such relations between our states and peoples.

Question: I should now like to touch on the theme of regional conflicts. Could you dwell on this?

Answer: This is a big and complex question. Each regional conflict has its own roots, its own "case history," so to speak, and its own specific cure.

I shall try to illustrate that by reference to the example of Afghanistan, where the policy of national reconciliation, which the Afghan leadership is consistently pursuing, is gradually changing the situation in the country. Entire rebel groups are ceasing their combat actions and refugees are returning to their abandoned homes. The number of those who have returned would be much greater had the Pakistani and Iranian authorities not placed obstacles in the refugees' way. The idea of creating a coalition government -- an idea which presupposes the division of power among all the forces who support or who are prepared to support internal peace and the ending of bloodshed -- has become moot. A law has been passed permitting the activity of political parties. The country's new draft constitution is being submitted for nationwide discussion.

All this creates the conditions for the establishment of peace in Afghanistan. Failing to see that is tantamount to not wanting a settlement of the Afghan question.

National reconciliation in Afghanistan is, of course, a matter solely for the Afghans themselves, including those Afghans who find themselves beyond the country's borders. The need there is for dialogue, talks, and greater trust between opposing sides.

In principle, the question of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan already has been decided. We favor a speeding up of the withdrawal [my za to chtoby sroki vyvoda byli szhatymi]. However, the interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs must be ended and the nonresumption of this interference guaranteed.

Then there is the Cambodian problem. Some encouraging signs of the possibility of a settlement seem to have appeared. The understanding that this question can only be solved by political means has become established. A specific deadline has been fixed for the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops and we are confident that it will be observed. But the most important thing, in our view, is that the idea of national consensus is slowly but surely gaining ground. Here, too, dialogue must prevail over confrontation; here, too, a coalition of national forces is possible.

In this context I believe that the ASEAN countries can also make their own not inconsiderable contribution to the incipient process. We are aware of the initiatives put forward by Indonesia and some other countries and we welcome them.

We express solidarity with the DPRK's policy, which is aimed at the peaceful unification of the country and the removal of military tension. We also understand the desire of South Korea's population to rid themselves of foreign troops and military bases together with their nuclear weapons.

The Iran-Iraq war: It has long ceased to be a purely bilateral affair. The escalation of the bloody carnage already has become a challenge to the world community and its ability to limit the development of events of particular danger to the whole world. The UN Security Council has adopted a rsolution demanding a cease-fire and an end to all military actions and the withdrawal of Iranian and Iraqi troops to the internationally recognized borders. We voted for that resolution.

We recently gave our official assessment of the situation in the Persian Gulf and the factors that have aggravated it. I shall only say that measures can be taken to take the heat out of this question, too, if the desire is there. We have that desire.

While seeking to extinguish existing raging conflagrations it is necessary to prevent new ones from appearing or becoming worse. Here I have in mind the aggravation of the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. It is good that the interested states are showing the necessary restraint which, unfortunately, cannot be said about some states whose considerable geographical distance from the center of the conflict is inversely [word as published] proportional to their clearly inflammatory activity.

Question: Everyone is well aware of the great significance of Soviet-Chinese relations for international peace and security, particularly in Asia. How have they been developing recently?

Answer: Our relations with the PRC are characterized by a gradual broadening of contacts. A noticeable improvement has appeared in the development of trade-economic, scientific-technical, and cultural ties and great reserves have been found in all these spheres. Political dialogue is also in progress. We have no intention of curtailing it. Consultations are under way and talks on border questions have resumed.

The two nuclear powers in Asia -- the USSR and the PRC -- have assumed a commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons. The Asian and Pacific countries cannot be indifferent to the question of whether or not the other nuclear powers eventually adopt a similar commitment.

Question: How do you assess the development of the Soviet Union's relations with Japan?

Answer: Their state is not very certain at the moment. In recent years efforts have been made to impart momentum to them and to create a normal climate in these relations. [paragraph continues]

I believe that both sides have incentives for doing this -- and not only economic incentives. The Soviet Union and Japan could establish a serious, solid partnership which, I am sure, would be a significant factor in the stability of the Asia-Pacific region as a whole.

Not so long ago there seemed to be a ray of hope, and discussion even began about my visiting Japan. I was inwardly prepared to visit that remarkable country, which plays a tremendous part in the world economy and is playing an increasingly notable part in world politics. But there are forces in Japan that managed to drive dark clouds up over the horizon again.

Question: How do you view the USSR's role in the development of regional economic cooperation?

Answer: Normal economic contacts can and must be developed on the basis of healthy, civilized relations of all kinds, be they general political, diplomatic, or simply human. Unfortunately, we have encountered more than once a situation where our wish to establish good relations or even simply diplomatic and trade relations with a particular country has been placed in the category of perfidious political intrigues. Sometimes the big guns of political pressure are used in an effort to intimidate the governments and public of small states that are still finding their feet.

Can you imagine the Soviet Union's protesting against the U.S. or British establishment of normal relations with Pacific islands or other states?

It is absurd: We have never done so and we would not do so. We do not develop our relations with anyone at the expense of third countries' interests. The best and only sound basis for international relations is equality, mutual respect, noninterference in internal affairs, and mutual advantage. The best and only sound basis for international relations is equality, mutual respect, noninterference in internal affairs, and mutual advantage. The Soviet national committee for Asia-Pacific economic cooperation, which we are setting up at the moment, will serve this very purpose.

I also want to say the following. In accordance with the concept of the country's accelerated socioeconomic development -- especially since the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum -- we have been paying heightened attention to the territories on the other side of the Urals whose economic potential is several times greater than that of the European part of the USSR.

Joint firms and enterprises, set up in cooperation with business circles in countries of the Asia-Pacific region, could participate in the development of resources in these areas.

For us the idea of universal security incorporates international economic security. An analysis of the available potential convinces us that the best way to achieve this is to implement the principle of "disarmament for development."

For the moment it might be possible to implement a program of immediate action to ease the developing world's debt burden. It might include the resumption of the net inflow of financial resources into the developing countries and, as far as possible, the removal of private bank abuses from the area of international credit. We believe the way to do this is to expand interstate aid to these countries on preferential terms.

Question: Finally, I would like to know your opinion of Soviet-Indonesian relations and of the part Indonesia is playing in modern world politics.

Answer: A great distance lies between us, but Soviet people have a good memory and a sharp eye for history. We remember the years of Soviet-Indonesian cooperation at the beginning of your postcolonial history. At that time, having gained independence, your people acquired many friends in the Soviet land. The world "merdeka" -- "freedom" -- gave your paper its name, and we know and cherish it.

The evident progress in relations between our countries, the high-level contacts, the projected visit to our country by Indonesian President Mr Suharto, and the upcoming meetings with Foreign Minister Mr Kusumaatmaja -- all this gives one the idea that Soviet-Indonesian cooperation will rise to a qualitatively new level.

Indonesia -- a dynamically developing state, a member of the Nonaligned Movement and ASEAN, an active participant in the solution of many world and regional problems -- will, we are sure, play an ever-growing role. We believe that Indonesia, as one of the world's biggest states and now the fifth-most populous power, will have many important contributions to make to international politics.

We have a common appreciation of the need to curb the arms race and safeguard international security, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region. We also regard the transfer of the arms race to space as impermissible. We have given the Indonesian leadership broad and comprehensive information about the consequences for peace if the ABM Treaty is undermined.

Our positions and Indoesia's coincide in most key aspects. All this is a fine basis for comprehensive and mutually advantageous contacts -- on a bilateral basis and within the ASEAN framework. Our potential here is extensive. Is this not evidenced by the prospects for Soviet-Indonesian cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space?

I want to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people sincere respect for the Republic of Indonesia and for the Indonesian people and to convey to them cordial greetings and best wishes.

U.S. Comment on Interview

LD230653 Moscow TASS in English 0631 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] Washington July 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

An extraordinary press conference was held at the White House Wednesday evening. It was devoted to the proposals for liquidation of medium-range and shorter-range missiles not only in Europe but also globally, advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in an interview to the newspaper MERDEKA.

A White House spokesman read out a statement which says that the administration welcomes reports on the proposals made in the interview and that the American delegation in Geneva is ready to work in a constructive spirit in Geneva.

And then reservations were made right away that it is necessary to thoroughly study the whole text of the interview, to see if there are "unacceptable terms" there, to wait what concrete proposals to that score will be made by the Soviet delegation at the Geneva negotiations.

The new Soviet proposals immediately attracted great attention of the U.S. mass media. Detailed excerpts from the interview were transmitted by the AP and UPI news agencies, radio stations and television. The keynote of the commentaries on the proposals is that the Soveit Union has again taken constructive steps towards as early attainment of an agreement at the Soviet-American Geneva negotiations.

Mikhail Gorbachev, AP underlines, has made a new step towards the United States in the course of the negotiations. The host of the ABC television evening news programme described the proposals as "an important step".

Kenneth Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in an ABC TV interview admitted that the Soviet Union-proposed "global zero" on medium-range and shorter-range missiles would remove many differences now existing between the United States and the Soviet Union on questions of verification of compliance with the agreement, now being negotiated in Geneva.

U.S. ESCORT OF TANKERS SEEN AS 'INSUPPORTABLE'

PM231001 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kuvshinnikov report: "Military Escalation -- A Dangerous Course"]

[Excerpt] M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has sent President Reagan a reply to the latter's message in connection with the Iran-Iraq conflict. B. Pyadyshev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, made this announcement when beginning a briefing on current questions of world politics. [passage omitted]

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement caused a stir among journalists. The correspondent from Kuwait's AL-WATAN and U.S. journalists representing the LOS ANGELES TIMES and AP asked in view of this new factor for an assessment of the general prospects for Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the process of settling the situation in the Persian Gulf and of the attitude to specific steps taken by the U.S. Administration, in particular the escorting of Kuwaiti tankers.

"We believe," the Soviet spokesman replied, "that political measures involving the Security Council could play an important role in the settlement process. The USSR and the United States are cooperating within the Security Council framework. That cooperation resulted in the adoption on Monday of a resolution appealing to Iran and Iraq to declare an immediate cease-fire. The peace-making role of the UN secretary general is now coming to the fore. He has been given the Security Council's mandate, and it is to be hoped that his efforts will help to turn the provisions of the resolution into practical actions. The Soviet Union is prepared to give these peace-making efforts every assistance.

The escorting of tankers is a pretext for a further build up of the U.S. military presence in the Gulf. We consider such a course politically insupportable and in terms of the overall situation dangerous, the Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed.

'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM VIEWS DISARMAMENT TALKS

LD190208 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 17 Jul 87

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." With me on the panel, as usual, Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov. The subject today: the INF talks.

Not long ago, in fact, quite recently in the United States we were all presented with a very rosy view. The idea was: agreement is around the corner; agreement is just a pen stroke away; there will be a summit in the fall; and everything looked wonderful. Now, suddenly, a blackout, no news. And then a change of pace and we are told that the Soviets are foot-dragging on the issue. There was a very tough-worded statement made by Kenneth Adelman. He said: There is no way we are going to have a summit in the autumn to sign an INF accord with the Soviets retaining 100 missiles, that is 100 warheads, in Asia. There have been all kinds of signals to the effect that the Soviets for some reason are pulling back. What's happened?

[Bogdanov] I believe that really we have to handle a very difficult, very sensitive question because we -- not only we sitting around this table but a number of people, a substantial number of people at our end -- are really puzzled: What's going on in Geneva? Why there is such a change of climate, of mood? One day you have a very rosy picture, as you put, the other day you have something very pessimistic, and the third day you have statements like you have mentioned just now.

And I would prefer, you know, to find out an answer in the American domestic situation. And I believe that all the forces within the administration and outside the American Administration, traditionally against any deal with the Soviet Union, may be fighting their last battle, trying to sabotage the INF agreement which is very much within the reach because they understand if we strike a deal -- I mean we, American and Soviet sides, we strike a deal -- that will be really a new chapter in the arms control business and the next presidency; whoever comes to the White House will have to deal with qualitatively new situation. They are very much against that. That's my theory. Maybe I'm wrong, but as a student of the American scene I come to that conclusion. And you have a very big, you know, activization of factions within the administration fighting against that. Otherwise you cannot explain why they have on the table a draft treaty, and if you judge by four or five problems lying on the table, four or five difficulties, you can come to the conclusion that they are not ominous difficulties that you cannot overcome. They are just to be handled as they are soluble, if you...

[Pozner, interrupting] All right, well let's look at those difficulties. What exactly is the argument about, supposedly? Dr Plekhanov? What are the problems that are suddenly holding up what seemed to be an almost guaranteed agreement?

[Plekhanov] Well, there are two aspects here. As far as the 100 missiles in the Asian part of the USSR...

[Pozner, interrupting] You're talking about 100 warheads?

[Plekhanov] A hundred warheads -- that's right, I'm sorry -- which Mr Adelman has mentioned. That represents a reopening of an issue which seems to have already been settled between the two sides; that is, the elimination of medium-range missiles from Europe would leave 100 warheads in the Asian part of the Soviet Union and 100 such warheads on the American territory. That was the agreement which was reached 2 years ago, I mean...

[Pozner, interrupting] In other words, the initial proposal would be a zero option in Europe...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yes. And that does not foreclose the elimination of the remaining missiles, those in Asia and the ones in the American territory, at a later stage. But at this stage, so far, the understanding was between the two sides that we just concentrate on the European part.

[Pozner] So now these 100 warheads...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] That seems like a backtracking...

[Pozner, interrupting] Have been brought back into the discussion.

[Plekhanov] That's right, that's right. As far as other issues are concerned, the Soviet Union has been very active in formulating specific proposals, meeting the concerns on the American side to the extent that that is possible. And in that sense I think that there is no need for such a pessimistic assessment on the part of the Americans that are saying that the Soviet Union is foot-dragging. What the Soviet Union is doing is trying to work out conditions which would be acceptable to both sides. Unfortunately, the American side -- and I'd hate it to sound like haggling over details, but there are certain elements in the American position, and I agree with Dr Bogdanov that that does reflect the domestic situation in the United States and the unwillingness in some parts in the administration to really work seriously for an agreement -- there some elements in the American position which really preclude progress toward an agreement.

[Pozner] For instance?

[Plekhanov] We are hopeful that they will be overcome. For instance, an insistence by the Americans that when the withdrawal of missiles begins, that the Soviet Union starts withdrawing its missiles while the United States for a while keeps its missiles there. [sentence as heard] I don't see any reason why that should be, there should be such...

[Pozner, interrupting] A difference in the timetable.

[Plekhanov] Yes, Yes. Then another one is that the United States insists on the right to turn the Pershing-2 missiles, which are to be eliminated, into a new type of missile which would be stationed in West Germany. Now, that would be a very scary thing, because the technology for remaking a Pershing-2 into an operational missile, to the extent that it has been developed, the technology would be very smooth and that technology also makes it possible to turn an operational missile back into a Pershing-2 missile, a medium-range missile.

[Bogdanov] Some people say that that [transformation] can be made within few hours.

[Plekhanov] Yes, Yes.

[Pozner] All right then. Correct me if I'm wrong. I was under the impression that the agreement as it is being developed and the Soviet proposal was not simply to withdraw the INF's...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yes.

[Pozner] ...but to destroy them...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Exactly.

[Pozner] ...to eliminate them physically.

[Plekhanov] Yes.

[Pozner] Now if the Soviets are going to eliminate them physically under the international control then shouldn't the United States be expected to do the same thing?

[Plekhanov] Absolutely.

[Pozner] So what you are saying, then, is that the United States proposes not to physically eliminate its missiles but to take the Pershing-2's and turn them into something else?

[Plekhanov] And not only that but also withdrawing the land-based cruise missiles and putting them on ships, turning them into sea-launched cruise missiles which you can deploy in any aquatorium [as heard], in any, at sea, which would, as far as the Soviet Union in concerned it doesn't really matter whether they are based on a ship in, say, the Baltic or in the North Sea or on the territory of, say, Belgium or West Germany.

[Pozner] It's almost as if the Soviet Union suggested, if it were possible, to take its SS-20's and put them on some sea-based carriers in the European seas and say: Okay, now we've eliminated them from Europe.

[Plekhanov] Yes, that would be exactly..

[Bogdanov, interrupting] It sounds, it's really like that. So what we have just been discussing here, it reflects the very artificial kind of objections from the American side, artificial in the way, in the sense that they can, if you have no poliltical will to strike a deal you invent another, you know, hundred or set of objections of the same kind just to sabotage the agreement.

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Yes, I agree with that. There is one issue which I have not mentioned and that has to do with the 72 operational-tactical missiles which are stationed in West Germany.

[Pozner] Yes, I wanted to bring that up.

[Plekhanov] Yes. The missiles are controlled by the Bundeswehr, by the West German Army. The warheads are controlled by the United States.

[Bogdanov] They belong...

[Plekhanov and Bogdanov, interrupting] They belong to the United States.

[Pozner] But that's part of the general agreement, nonproliferation and so on, that the United States cannot give its warheads to any other nation.

[Plekhanov] That's right. Now that we're discussing the double zero for Europe -- that is, elimination not only of medium-range missiles but also of operational missiles -- obviously the question of those 72 missiles crops up and the United States (?says): No, no, you can't touch that, because...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, not missiles -- warheads, warheads.

[Plekhanov] Well, yes, but missiles also have, yes...

[Pozner, interrupting] But we're not -- as far as I know -- the Soviet side is not saying anything about the West German missiles. What it's talking about is the American nuclear warheads that tip those missiles.

[Plekhanov] Absolutely; of course. But, you know, a warhead can't fly without a missile.

[Pozner] True, but you can take them off and put on a nonnuclear warhead...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] That's right, that's right.

[Pozner] ...Which is a different story.

[Plekhanov] Yes. Anyway, we're talking about those missiles, and the Americans say, no, no, you can't touch those because they are with the West Germans, which raises a whole number of questions. If those warheads are controlled by the United States, if they belong to the United States, then obviously they should come under the cuts under the agreement with the Soviet Union. If they are not controlled by the United States, if they really belong to the West Germans, then that raises a question of whether the United States is honoring the Nonproliferation Treaty, because the West Germans are not supposed to have control over any nuclear weapons. So it's either this or that, but the position that those 72 warheads -- and each of them is about 10 times as powerful as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima -- so what we are talking about is a potential of about 700 Hiroshimas stationed on the West German soil.

[Pozner] Now all of these so-called problems -- and I say so-called for a definite reason -- have suddenly appeared as if no one thought of them before and now here they are on the stage, blocking progress. One would tend to think that this reflects, as Dr Bogdanov indicated, an effort to stymie if not torpedo the agreement. And I recall when we were sitting at this table a couple of weeks ago, perhaps a month ago, we were talking about the reality of reaching an agreement on INF and of having a summit in the fall, I thought you, Dr Plekhanov, were somewhat upbeat and optimistic about it; I certainly was, and our friend Dr Bogdanov was not. He was saying: Well, I'll believe it when I see it and it's very difficult to deal with the present administration. He was somewhat pessimistic. I have the feeling now that perhaps his pessimism was more well-based than my optimism at least. Dr Bogdanov, how do you feel in the sense of being clairvoyant?

[Bogdanov] I feel not well at ease, frankly, because I would like very much this deal to be really reached, because it is so easy for us in that, I prefer to forget about my, you know, my personal assessment, forget about it, and I, frankly, I prefer you were right, not me.

[Pozner] Yes.

[Bogdanov] But you have a very typical picture of the American domestic politics. Every day brings America closer and closer to the election, presidential election, and people in the White House, around the White House, in the parties, get more and more busy with the election calculations than with some other problems. And now, now, for instance yesterday, if I'm not mistaken, NEW YORK TIMES published an article that summit is such a distant, become such a distant possibility that we could even forget about it. The time is running out, time is very short. You cannot reach an agreement, strike a deal, tomorrow, you will have to work on that for so many months to put it in details, on paper and things like that.

So that kind of pessimism reflects not only tactical moves -- some people say they are so nearby the treaty that they are trying to trade off now at the last minute to get more and more concessions. I was to believe in that maybe a week ago, but now I'm afraid that things are more serious than just tactical moves. And, after all, there is a basic problem, which is for me, as a student of American political life, is: Is this administration able to deliver? That's my question. And, unfortunately, my answer to it after the hearings and all that what happened in America, my answer is half no. I emphasize: Not full no, but half no; maybe more than half no. They are not able. But let's see, let's see.

[Pozner] Well, that certainly is a difficult situation for the world, because, in my opinion, if the INF talks fall through, if there is no agreement, it's going to make it extremely difficult to move ahead in any other area. I think that we all tend to believe that INF is a relatively -- relatively, I repeat this -- simple issue to solve, much more so than strategic offensive weapons, let alone a whole area of other ones. So if this does not work it may turn out to be a block for many, many other agreements.

[Bogdanov] You're quite right, Vladimir. That's another tragedy of the whole story. I wouldn't like to blame anybody. I wouldn't like to pinpoint that -- that's the enemy of the treaty, that's the enemy of this and that, no. But really I hate to believe that we again become a hostage of the American domestic situation. It is not fair. The world community is bigger than America, the world community and world community's interests is more deep than any other interests in this world. That's my point.

[Pozner] I think it's an important point, especially considering that the tone has been, now recently, that if the Soviets do not agree to this, that and the other then -- and I quote -- Moscow will not have a summit in the fall. [no unquote as heard] It's almost seen as if Moscow needs the summit more than Washington.

[Plekhanov] That's the usual trick that the American media plays, you know. I think that...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, I'm afraid that Americans, I would like to protect in this case American media. They say what they have been supplied with...

[Plekhanov] Yes, well, of course...

[Bogdanov] ...supplied from some quarters, from the adminnistration with that trick, what you call quite rightly trick, that we need, Moscow needs that summit, is dying to have that summit [chuckles], which is not the case, I'm sorry, to put it mildly.

[Pozner] We have only about 30 seconds left, so, Dr Plekhanov, if you want to sum up, please go ahead, but keep in mind our time limit.

[Plekhanov] Well, I feel very much hopeful that there will be some new factors on the scene in the United States which would help overcome the difficulties, because if that does not happen then we will be all thrown back until 1989 and we will have the same issues on the table, maybe even new problems, more difficult problems, than now.

[Pozner] Well, I'm sure that Dr Bogdanov joins you in that hope; I know I certainly do.

[Bogdanov] I'm more pessimistic.

[Pozner] I know, you always are, but still you hope that it happens. At least it is clear that the Soviet intentions ae for reaching an agreement. And now on behalf of Top Priority, we invite you to join us a week from today at the same time for another panel discussion. I won't be with you; I'll be on vacation, but you'll be hearing my colleague Pavel Kuznetsov. Until then, on behalf of the panel and myself I wish you all good listening.

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM191500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 87 Second Edition p 4

["International Review" column by Igor Melnikov]

[Text] Let Us Not Blow Up the World [subhead]

"...Surely we are wise enough to find mutual understanding and not to blow up the world because we are different?" These words, uttered by M.S. Gorbachev the other day in a conversation with the Latin American writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez, could be the epigraph to the many hundreds of articles, scientific tracts, and reports that have appeared everywhere on the eve of the past week, when mankind welcomed the birth of our planet's 5 billionth inhabitant.

Indeed, inhabitants of all continents are asking if we have different colored skins, if the social system in our countries is not the same, if we have different views of international events, if that really is a reason why nuclear catastrophe should break out, if it really is necessary to put to the test an already fragile world? And why should mankind live in fear of the future?

The planet's best minds have long raised this question. Now, thanks to the new way of thinking, which is resolutely finding its way to the people's masses and penetrating government cabinets, the absurdity of war preparations and the shortsightedness of the position of strength policy are becoming increasingly obvious. It is no longer isolated intellectuals, but millions of the earth's inhabitants who are becoming convinced that the time has come to turn swords into plowshares and channel the resources freed into social needs and creative goals. The guarantee of mankind's survival today is the creation of a nonviolent world free from nuclear weapons. And nothing else.

Last Wednesday saw the publication of the answer of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to the appeal by participants in the U.S.-Soviet "Peace March". Everyone who values peace, he stressed, has in the Soviet Union a firm and unswerving ally in the attainment of these truly sacred human goals.

People everywhere are now talking about the processes of restructuring and openness in the Soviet Union. Attention is drawn to the fact that our party is transforming the new approaches in internal affairs into foreign policy initiatives. People abroad cannot fail to see that these are not slogans, but real, practical proposals submitted to the judgement of the international community. Here the Soviet side does not lay claim to absolute truth, but heeds other people's opinions.

These are the facts, and it is hard to dispute facts. So the question arises, do not international relations need restructuring in light of the progressive development and qualitative changes in the policy and behavior of states? It is noteworthy that some of the West's leading politicians verbally admit this necessity to some degree. But when it comes to real actions.... Alas, here one obstacle after another is erected in the path of progressive development.

The events of the past week clearly confirms this.

NATO's Vienna "Waltz" [subhead]

On studying recent statements by Washington officials, looking at cables from the foreign agencies, and leafing through the Western newspapers, at present you cannot escape the thought that the United States, together with the most zealous allies, is already trying on the leaders' jersey in the competition for the speediest resolution of questions of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament.

When you hear that, you think: Butter would not melt in your mouths, gentlemen. But how do things really stand?

First, let us look at Vienna, where the representative meeting of participants in the CSCE in Europe is in progress. Today a wind of euphoria is still blowing through the residences of the delegations accredited there from the 16 NATO states. A burst of cheerfulness is being experienced in connection with their submission of proposals on 10 July on military aspects of security in Europe.

But what cause for rejoicing is there, really? Of course, one could heave a sigh of relief in view of the fact that the NATO document has indeed been put on the conference table, albeit very late. But the sense of relief is mingled with concern: Where is the adequate response to the package of proposals submitted by the socialist countries?

The NATO document suffers from a number of substantial shortcomings. One is struck first of all by the desire to remove disarmament questions from the problems covered by the next stage of the Stockholm Conference. Why, you gentlemen from NATO? Remember: The Stockholm forum is actually called a conference "on Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe."

And another thing. This document tries to exclude the neutral and nonaligned countries of the continent from participating on an equal basis in the examination and resolution of the problem of European disarmament from the Atlantic to the Urals. [paragraph continues]

Lastly, it is not hard to find in it evidence of a desire to avoid real reductions of armed forces and armaments in Europe and to preclude the examination of the questions of tactical nuclear weapons at future talks.

In a word, the NATO side has not taken off the record player the Vienna "waltz" of delays, hiatuses, and procrastinations which it knows by heart. Certainly it has plenty of experience -- a decade and a half of fruitless discussions in the Hofburg Palace on reducing the military confrontation in central Europe.

The experience of international forums on disarmament questions in recent years graphically confirms that our country does not play at politics, that its energetic actions are not aimed at pleasing anyone or winning a propaganda prize. You have to look deeper. The Soviet Union is true to its peace-loving line. It realizes that things cannot be dragged out any longer, that it is time to set an example in practice.

That is our principled position.

Shifting the Blame [subhead]

Official Washington and certain other NATO powers choose a different position. At the first opportunity (and sometimes without it) they gamble on the propaganda prize. The U.S. Administration's ardor appeared particularly indomitable last week. It chose the Geneva talks as the "battlefield."

The Reagan administration, we read in THE NEW YORK TIMES, has criticized the Soviet Union for the fact that, it says, there is a delay in arms control talks and the process of preparations for a summit meeting. The newspaper quotes a statement by State Department spokesman Charles Redman: "The impression is created that in the last week or two the Soviet Union has departed from what we could regard as a constructive or positive approach to the problem of resolving some of the most complex questions." Realizing that the verbal camouflage requires at least some degree of deciphering, the State Department official declared that the USSR is "slowing the pace of the Geneva talks, where the two sides are discussing problems of reducing short- and medium-range missiles."

At almost the same time, THE NEW YORK TIMES published a long article by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The fervor of his "denunciations" was so unparalleled that he even -- unprecedentedly! -- quoted Marx: "The difference between an incomplete zero option and a true zero option is one of those cases where, as Karl Marx said, quantity turns into quality. From any point of view -- arms control, strategy, policy -- a true zero option would be a more successful outcome. We are ready for it. Are the Soviets ready for it?"

So what is being done in broad daylight? Through Moscow's fault, the Geneva talks have supposedly lost pace, and the Soviet delegation is deliberately slowing down the discussion and, in a number of cases, is even departing from its positions. There is something to lose your peace, sleep, and even appetite over!

But let us reassure the agitated Adelman. The Soviet Union is ready for the most radical reduction in nuclear arms. Ready -- as it was during the Reykjavik meeting -- for their total elimination.

Now, as to what is really happening in Geneva. Let Adelman learn the truth, since his officials, and their State Department colleagues, are, to put it mildly, not too objective. [paragraph continues]

The facts show that in the 3 weeks since the start of the present round of the Geneva talks, the USSR delegation has put forward seven concrete proposals. Each of them takes careful account of the U.S. side's concerns. If the elaboration of a joint draft treaty on medium-range missiles has not yet been completed, there is only one reason — Washington's unconstructive position and its desire to write into the medium-range missiles treaty commitments that secure military advantages for the U.S. side.

So THE WASHINGTON POST observers R. Evans and R. Novak are much closer to the truth than the "naive" Adelman. "As administration officials admit," they write, "they do not know what is on Moscow's mind. Their concern is aggravated by the fact that the Kremlin has stepped up its demand for the withdrawal of the old Pershing-1 missiles within the framework of the new treaty."

Quite right. All the same, THE WASHINGTON POST observers mention only one of the obstacles created by the Americans at the Geneva talks. It is worth adding to this list and asking: Why does the United States insist on unilateral reductions in Soviet medium-range missiles at the first stage; why does it need to preserve the possibility of reequipping Pershing-2's and Pershing-1B's and turning ground-launched cruise missiles into sea-launched cruise missiles; why does it refuse to discuss the question of verification with regard to U.S. military bases in third countries, which could be associated with American medium-range missiles?

The fuss over the 72 U.S. nuclear warheads for West German Pershing-1A missiles is particularly provocative. Of course, here responsibility cannot be lifted from those circles in the FRG which entertain dangerous plans for modernizing missile weapons, looking covetously at the U.S. nuclear charges for Pershings. In a recent issue of the Hamburg magazine STERN, things are called by their names. Defense Minister M. Woerner "plans to use the new generation of medium-range missiles," while in the safe of E. Eimler, commander of the Bundeswehr Air Force, there are the "tactical requirements for the next model of the very same West German Pershing-1A missiles that are causing such a dispute between East and West in the struggle for disarmament.

It is hardly necessary to prove that such maneuvers exacerbate the situation on our continent, by no means promote the strengthening of confidence in Europe, and, frankly speaking, in terms of their potential outcome, rank with irresponsible statements to the effect that the "German question" remains open, that all is not clear regarding the "lands in the East," and that Yalta and Potsdam are "unlawful." Not for nothing did the West German newspaper STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG give its traditional foreign policy commentary a very eloquent headline: "Woerner Torpedoes the Disarmament Process."

But let us come back to the question of the U.S. side's responsibility on the question of the Pershing-1A's. It constantly declares the desirability of resolving the problem of operational and tactical and medium-range missiles on a "global zero" basis. (Let us recall, for instance, the impassioned words I quoted from Adelman, about the "true zero option.") But what kind of "zero" can it be, if U.S. nuclear warheads for the Bundeswehr missiles remain in Europe?

How short is the memory of Washington officials! They simply cannot figure out why Moscow is making a fuss about the 72 "unfortunate," almost obsolete missiles. But the whole point is that it is not a question of missiles as such, but of nuclear warheads on them. Lastly, there is the generally recognized Treaty Against Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. So why does the United States want to violate a treaty which bears its signature?

Instead of a lengthy resume, let me say briefly: It ill behooves Washington and NATO to assume the role of leader over the marathon distance of disarmament. It ill behooves them to represent the Soviet position as a brake at the talks. In Russian, we call that shifting the blame.

Lessons of the Visit [subhead]

Yesterday the newspapers published a report on the latest CPSU Central Committee Politburo session. A significant place in the report was allocated to the subject of the results of the conversations and talks between Soviet leaders and FRG Federal President R. von Weizsaecker and FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, who were in the USSR for a visit. These contacts were assessed positively, since they made it possible to compare our countries' positions on international affairs and to focus attention on questions of ending the arms race, promoting disarmament, and fundamentally improving the situation in central Europe and on the need for a new, fresh approach to resolving today's problems.

The West German public and the country's mass media are accustomed to numerous foreign trips by their statesmen. So why have the commentaries on this visit remained in the newspapers and on television screens in the FRG for a record time, so to speak? There can be only one reason. The talks in Moscow confirmed that despite political and ideological contradictions and their different military-strategic orientations, the USSR and the FRG can be partners. As for our country, it reaffirms its readiness to develop firm relations with the FRG as a significant West European partner, relations which do not depend on changing circumstances. Naturally, Bonn in its turn must demonstrate a similar readiness and not burden it with anything.

The results of the FRG federal president's visit to the Soviet Union allow us to say that broad objective opportunities exist for our countries to cooperate in building the common European home on the basis of recognition and respect for the realities in Europe, strict compliance with the Moscow treaty, and the infusion of life into that treaty. So why not open a new chapter in USSR-FRG relations through joint efforts? A chapter meeting the interests of the two countries' peoples as well as the interests of the whole continent. It would be good if the first page in that chapter was the mutual desire to rid the European Continent of medium-range nuclear weapons and operational and tactical missiles.

DELEGATION HEAD INTERVIEWED ON ECOSOC SESSION

PM170955 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with E. Ye. Obminskiy, head of the Soviet ECOSOC delegation, by own correspondent V. Kuznetsov under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview" and headlined "Considering New Realities"; in Geneva -- date not given]

[Text] Geneva -- The Geneva section of the second annual UN Economic and Social Council [ECOSOC] session has completed its work at the Palace of Nations. Its 54 participants discussed a broad range of issues concerning vital problems of international economic relations. IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuznetsov asked E. Ye. Obminskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, to discuss the main results of the Geneva forum.

The session, he said, discussed the questions of stabilizing the world economy and strengthening ECOSOC's role in the development of international cooperation in the trade, economic, scientific, and technical spheres. The session adopted a series of useful decisions aimed at improving the coordination of activity between UN organizations and institutions in socioeconomic and scientific and technical areas.

It also adopted a number of acutely political decisions concerning UN organizations' implementation of the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, sovereignty for the Israeli-occupied Arab terrritories, and assistance for the Palestinian people. On this last issue, only the Americans were opposed to the resolution being adopted.

During the discussion of problems of world economic development, many developing countries showed acute dissatisfaction with the "adaptation programs" imposed on them by the IMF and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which are only aggravating their social and economic problems. The session also discussed major economic problems, such as developing countries' foreign debt, the outflow of resources from these countries to developed states, the food problem, and a series of other issues.

The tendency to see the world economy's development as lying in growing interdependence between national economies was clearly apparent at the session. There is an urgent need to interpret the causes of economic instability in the world and to jointly decide how to build constructive, creative collaboration between states and peoples to resolve vital tasks common to all mankind in the socioeconomic and scientific and technical spheres.

The Warsaw Pact document "On Overcoming Underdevelopment and Establishing a New International Economic Order" met with a positive response at the session. There is an urgent need for radical changes in political thinking and international practice, a fair international division of labor, and the implementation of inalienable sovereignty over national natural resources. I would like to stress that this desire for collective decisions met with approval in the resolution submitted by the Soviet Union that the 42d UN General Assembly session should continue in a businesslike spirit discussion of the concept of international economic security as part of a general international security system.

It must be said that in the discussion of issues on the agenda, a different approach was displayed by the United States and its closest allies, which, on a number of important issues, continue to think in outmoded terms; people across the ocean have not given up their attempts to establish fist-law for the strong in the world market.

The need was stressed at the session and particularly in conversations with various delegations to achieve real results and accords in the disarmament sphere, primarily between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It also was stressed that the funds and resources thereby freed can and must be used for development purposes. Delegates expressed the opinion that the forthcoming international conference on the interconnection between disarmament and development will be of great significance. The idea of setting up a development fund financed by disarmament would give a real boost to the Third World's emergence from its serious financial and economic situation. The USSR delegation distributed a document on the Soviet Union's economic cooperation with developing countries. The Soviet Union, the document states, assists developing countries in creating and reinforcing the most important economic sectors, shaping the national scientific and industrial base, modernizing agriculture, and training national cadres.

The session, E. Ye. Obminskiy concluded, was thus held in a spirit of interest in productive dialogue on the part of the majority of the participants and a desire to strive for specific results on the basis of constructive conditions and the rejection of relapses into isolationism, outmoded concepts, or attempts to resolve complex problems from a position of strength and overt pressure. [paragraph continues]

This year is really "negotiations year" -- many political and economic forums are called upon to draw up new proposals and prescriptions (it is particularly important to do this by the 42d UN General Assembly session) to work out new solutions in light of the realities of the world today.

FOREIGN MILITARY ATTACHES TAKE TRIP TO MINSK

PM211611 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVENZDA in Russian 18 Jul 87 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Visit by Military Diplomats"]

[Text] On 17 July the USSR Defense Ministry Foreign Relations Directorate organized a visit to Minsk for foreign military attaches and their assistants.

The military diplomats visited a troop unit in the Belorussian Military District where they were acquainted with combat training and with Soviet soldiers' everyday life and routine and they laid a wreath at the Kurgan Slavy monument.

U.S.-JAPAN SDI ACCORDS POINT TO 'OPEN HYPOCRISY'

LD222249 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Washington July 22 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

An agreement and secret protocols to it on Japan's participation in developing space weapons systems within the framework of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" were signed between the governments of the USA and Japan here on Tuesday. Thus, Japan has officially joined in the effort of escalating the arms race into outer space, which is a lethal danger to the whole humanity.

As a spokesman for the Pentagon said, the secret protocols list the specific measures within the framework of research and other work and name the Japanese firms that will implement them. This agreement, as a spokesman for the Pentagon said, is an important contribution to ensuring the security of the USA and Japan.

Yet, it is well-known that the militarisation of outer space, which is the aim of the SDI, will lead to an endless spiralling of the weapons race, which is increasingly getting out of control. This will critically increase the threat to the security not only of the USA and Japan, but also of all countries of the world.

On top of that, by officially joining in SDI the Japanese Government has crudely violated not only the international agreements banning the use of outer space with military aims, but also the resolution of the Japanese Parliament of 1969 permitting the exploration and use of outer space only with peaceful aims, the laws providing for a ban on the export of arms and military technology.

The Japanese Government has pointedly abandoned its stand which it took by voting at the U.N. in 1984 for a resolution calling for the prevention of militarisation of outer space and confirmed in the statement of Prime Minister Nakasone at the jubilee U.N. General Assembly session in October 1985 that the prevention of weapons race in outer space is one of mankind's most important aims. Japan's officially announced decision to participate in SDI is evidence that such assurances were nothing else but open hypocrisy.

As far as the U.S. Administration is concerned, in drawing Japan into the SDI agreement, it set the aim of broadly using Japan's technological potential for the speediest implementation of its designs for a militarisation of outer space. Simultaneously the USA has made Japan a direct accomplice in the attempts to torpedo with the aid of SDI the ABM Treaty, without whose strict observance any effective measures of control and a cut in strategic nuclear weapons are impossible. The creation and deployment of the SDI "defence systems," says the research published in the official "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD" of the USA, will untip the strategic balance between the USSR and the USA.

PRC, USSR ANNOUNCE 2D-ROUND OF BORDER TALKS

OW230944 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] As announced by a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman at a news briefing on Wednesday [22 July] in Beijing, it has been agreed between China and the Soviet Union that the second round of talks on the border issue will be held in Beijing, beginning 7 August.

The first round of these talks were held last February in Moscow.

CHAIRMEN OF USSR-PRC FRIENDSHIP SOCIETIES MEET

LD211728 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0945 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jul (TASS) -- Correspondent Gennadiy Gavrilenko reports:

The main task of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society is to strengthen friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples, declared Academician Sergey Tikhvinskiy, speaking at a meeting today with the delegation of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society led by Lin Zhaonan, member of the board of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries, who have come to the Soviet Union.

The 400 local organizations of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society pursue activities promoting the development of cultural and commercial and economic exchange between our countries, said Sergey Tikhvinskiy, who is chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society.

The society's activists are popularizing the two countries' revolutionary traditions, their struggle for the preservation of peace throughout the world, and they are acquainting the Soviet public with the rich cultural heritage of the Chinese people, the experience of socialist construction in China. The society also does much to acquaint the Chinese working people with Soviet reality, with the transformations in the Soviet country being implemented on the basis of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums.

Academician Tikhvinskiy told the Chinese guests of the society's plans for the current year.

In a reply speech Lin Zhaonan spoke of the fruitful work of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society in spreading knowledge of the Soviet people's culture and life to China.

The head of the Chinese delegation thanked his hosts for their warm reception and said our peoples are coming out together for strengthening international peace. He spoke of the work of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society and its plans for the future.

The delegation is to be received by August Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Chinese guests are to visit enterprises and cultural institutions of Moscow and will be going to Leningrad, Vilnius, and Kiev.

NAKASONE WELCOMES GORBACHEV DISARMAMENT OFFER

LD230900 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] Tokyo July 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko reports:

We welcome the proposal for liquidation of medium-range missiles globally which has been put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, Prime Minister of Japan Yasuhiro Nakasone said in parliament today.

General Secretary of the Cabinet of Ministers Masaharu Gotoda held a press conference in the course of which he noted that the new Soviet proposals for medium-range missiles in Asia coincided with the Japanese Government's stand on problems of medium-range missiles.

The government is thoroughly studying the USSR's initiatives which were set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's answers to questions of the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA, he said.

TASS Cites KYODO Comments

LD230532 Moscow TASS in English 0508 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] Tokyo July 23 TASS -- The statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on the Soviet Union's readiness to liquidate all its medium-range missiles also in the Asian part of the country opens up a realistic possibility for attaining an agreement at the Soviet-American negotiations on medium-range missiles, writes the Japanese KYODO TSUSHIN news agency, commenting on the USSR's new initiative to strengthen peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region.

Providing a detailed summary of the Soviet leader's answers to questions of the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA, KYODO TSUSHIN notes that the answers testify to the Soviet Union's striving for relaxation of tension in that part of the world.

AUSTRALIA CONTRIBUTED TO SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL

BK230920 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 23 Jul 87

[Text] The Soviet ambassador to Australia, Dr Samoteykin, said Australian submissions had played a part in Moscow's latest offer to scrap all medium-range missiles in Soviet Asia. Dr Samoteykin told a news conference in Canberra that Soviet and Australian positions on many nuclear disarmament issues were very close. From Canberra, Graeme Dobell reports:

[Begin recording] [Dobell] Dr Samoteykin said Australia had expressed anxiety about the Soviet Union retaining medium-range missiles in Asia. The prime minister, Mr Hawke, had put this concern to the Soviet foreign minister, Mr Shevardnadze, in talks in Canberra in March. The Soviet ambassador said that Mr Gorbachev's latest offer to scrap the Asian missiles was to some extent a result of the consultations with Australia. [Unidentified person] We took into consideration [words indistinct] the other neighboring countries that are much more closer than Australia, of course. But (?voice of) Australia was [words indistinct].

The Soviet ambassador would not comment directly on speculation that Mr Hawke will visit Moscow in October when he travels to Canada for the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, but Dr Samoteykin said Mr Hawke had accepted Mr Shevardnadze's invitation and it was up to the prime minister to choose the date. [end recording]

GUSEV EXCHANGES OPINIONS WITH CAMBODIA'S HUN SEN

LD201352 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 20 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS -- Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Gusev and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea Hun Sen who is vacationing in the USSR today exchanged opinions on questions of further upgrading of Soviet-Kampuchean ties in various areas. The sides declared for enhancing efficiency of the commercial and economic relations between the two countries, for a quest of new forms of cooperation, also by creating joint ventures. Complete identity of views on topical problems of the present-day international situation was confirmed during the meeting which passed in a cordial and comradely atmosphere.

LAOTIAN PARTY DELEGATION ENDS USSR VISIT

PM211553 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP], a delegation of LPRP officials visited the Soviet Union 9-20 July. The Lao comrades studied the experience of CPSU activities in the implementation of the Leninist nationality policy and had meetings and talks at party organizational work and propaganda departments and a CPSU Central Committee department.

The delegation visited the Azerbaijan SSR where it was received at the republic Communist Party Central Committee and acquainted itself with the work of a number of local party organizations and labor collectives.

COMMENTATORS ASSESS U.S. ROLE IN PERSIAN GULF

Shabayev on 'Obsolete Dogmas'

LD221621 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 22 Jul 87

["Under the Spell of Obsolete Dogmas" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 22 TASS -- Follows commentary by Boris Shabayev, TASS political news analyst:

According to reports reaching from the Persian Gulf zone, the missile launchers in the U.S. ships massed in the gulf waters have been "cocked" and the commanders have been ordered to fire each time when they see a "threat of hostile actions." Thus, the countdown to a military action fraught with unpredictable consequences is already measured in hours, if not less. Yet, Washington, to all appearances, does not intend to stop at the fatal line.

One cannot help drawing such a conclusion, in particular, from the pronouncements by a White House spokesman on the essence of the explosive situation which emerged in the gulf area. This concerns above all its sources and causes. It might seem that there is no doubt that the root cause of the aggravation of tensions is the continuation of the senseless bloodshed between Iran and Iraq. The buildup in that area of U.S. military presence is another no less important cause. Consequently, the real efforts to normalise the situation in the Gulf should be aimed at eliminating both.

Alas, this is not the case. The White House beleves that the Iran-Iraq conflict and the Pentagon's militaristic preparations are "separate issues". In other words, while voting at the U.N. Security Council for a resolution on a ceasefire on the Iran-Iraq front, the USA is at the same time taking steps which may only complicate and more probably frustrate the implementation of that resolution. Such an approach is evidence of at least a lack in the realistic approach to the problem of a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East.

Also indisputable is the fact that if one proceeds from the striving to ensure true freedom of navigation in that international waterway, since such are precisely the interests of many states, including the Soviet Union -- this creates favourable prerequisites for joint actions for the speediest elimination of all causes of the current crisis.

We in the Soviet Union realise that both the USA and other Western states have their interests in that region and do not intend to infringe upon them. This, in its turn, creates good prerequisites for constructive cooperation for a peaceful and just settlement.

What do we hear from Washington? The same spokesman for the White House makes it clear that the U.S. Administration has no intention to take advantage of that opportunity to view the situation in the world realistically, to discard the obsolete political standards and put out at least one seat of conflict.

Such unconstructive actions by Washington, the ITV [UK Independent Television] company says, is conducive to increasing loss of faith in the USA as a world power. This is a reasonable conclusion.

Levin Cites 'Saber-Rattling'

LD222044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] On the pretext of ensuring freedom of navigation, the United States has begun escorting Kuwaiti oil tankers. REUTER reported that the tankers "Bridgeton" and "Gas Prince", flying the U.S. flag and surrounded by ships of the U.S. Navy, have started to move toward the mouth of the Persian Gulf. Here is a commentary from the latest news. Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

[Levin] The entire world is focussing its attention on the progress of the tankers and the warships. Information agencies regularly report the position of the ships and what kind of situation is taking shape around them. In tone, the cables are reminiscent of reports from a theater of military operation. This reflects to a considerable extent the actual state of affairs.

As is stressed in all the reports, the U.S. ships have orders to open fire first if they have information about aggressive intentions. But it is quite obvious that such an order might also lead to military operations being started by the U.S. Navy as a result of a misunderstanding or because of excessive zeal on the part of one ship's commander or another. It is this heightened readiness of U.S. sailors to take to their weapons that puts one on one's guard most of all.

The situation in the Persian Gulf area is a tense one. There is more than enough explosive material there. In these conditions, it is quite obvious that maximum restraint is called for. Almost throughout the entire world the UN Security Council resolution has been received with profound satisfaction. The resolution demands that as the first step on the path to negotiations it is necessary for Iran and Iraq to cease military operations immediately and to withdraw all their troops to the internationally recognized borders. That resolution was adopted on the initiative of the five permanent members of the Security Council. The United States made a positive contribution in drawing it up. However, in my opinion, the actions of the United States in the Persian Gulf area are not in keeping with what was undertaken by U.S. diplomacy in the Security Council.

According to estimates, two tankers escorted by four ships need 48 hours to reach Kuwait. During these 48 hours, as can be judged from the reports regarding the command to open fire if a threat arises, U.S. officers intend to keep their fingers continually on the firing button. There are reports that the convoy of vessels will be guarded from the air by reconnaissance planes and bombers. This is mentioned in particular in a report from the DPA agency. While the involvement of reconnaissance aircraft in this operation may be explained, the inclusion of bombers in the air force escort has a menacing nature.

For the time being the passage of the tankers escorted by the U.S. warships has not provoked any excessive action, but no one can vouch for it that things will continue like this in the future. The United States is certainly overtly saber rattling in the Persian Gulf zone.

Agayants Assails 'Provocation'

LD221556 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Nikolay Agayants commentary]

[Text] The United States today started the operation of escorting Kuwaiti oil tankers. According to the REUTER press Agency, the tankers Bridgeton and Gas Prince, under U.S. flags and surrounded by vessels of the U.S. Navy headed for the mouth of the Persian Gulf. Our commentator Nikolay Agayants is at the microphone:

[Begin recording] Among the reports now arriving in our editorial office from abroad, there is a considerable number of telegrams devoted to the events taking place in the Persian Gulf and it must be said that these reports are more and more alarming. Despite the demands of the international public and contrary to common sense, Washington continues the dangerous escalation of the tension in the region. Under the pretext of protection of shipping, it has taken steps that cannot be called anything other than provocation, with consequences impossible to foretell. In reply to the Soviet proposals on withdrawing all warships of states having nothing to do with the region, the United States has announced that it does not intend to abandon the stepping up of its military power in the Gulf. Here, a fleet of the U.S. Navy, consisting of destroyers, cruisers, frigates, the aircraft carrier Constellation, and the landing flagship La Salle, have been concentrated in the area. In the near future, the group is to be joined by the battleship Missouri and three warships with escorts.

ASSSOCIATED PRESS correspondent (Tim Arsen), who presently is on board of one of the warships cruising the Gulf of Oman reports that Commander (David Youngers), who heads the tanker convoy, has said that if the Iranians attempt to launch a single missile, it would be their first and last attempt. We will sweep them away with all the might of our weaponry, the brave warrior said. Thus, obviously, gunpowder can be felt in the Persian Gulf, over which the clouds thicken. Judging by everything, events there are approaching that dangerous line beyond which regional conflicts risk growing into international crisis situations. It is obvious that such development of events evokes the most serious concern and worry of the entire international community, including the Soviet Union.

Our position is precise, clear, and consistent. The Soviet Government has proposed, I repeat, a number of immediately effective measures the adoption of which would, to a considerable degree, help to reduce tension in the Persian Gulf zone and achieve a quick end to the Iran-Iraq war. In particular, it was said that all warships of states having nothing to do with this region should be withdrawn from here as soon as possible, but Washington rejected these proposals and does not propose anything else. Why? I think the reply lies in that imperialist policy conducted by the present U.S. Administration. The Persian Gulf, Brzezinski once said, is a strategically important region for the United States and we have to adopt all the measures necessary to preserve our influence there. The same thought is being repeated today in the highest places in the U.S. authorities: Vice President Bush, Secretary of State Shultz, Secretary of Defense Weinberger, and the master of the White House, too, That, as they say, explains everything. [end recording]

Gavrilov Chides 'Cowboy-Style'

PM231043 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Jul 87 p 3

[Yu. Gavrilov "commentary": "Escort, Cowboy-style"; first paragraph is cited TASS report]

[Text] London, 22 Jul (TASS) -- On the pretext of "ensuring freedom of navigation," the United States has begun an operation to provide escorts for Kuwaiti oil tankers. According to REUTER, the tankers Bridgeton and Gas Prince have begun moving toward the entrance to the Persian Gulf under U.S. flags and with an entourage of U.S. Navy ships.

The situation in the Persian Gulf region continues to worsen. If the atmosphere is not defused, it will be fraught with unpredictable, dangerous consequences. Washington has begun the operation to provide a navy convoy for Kuwaiti tankers sailing under the U.S. Stars and Stripes contrary to sensible warnings. The world is, therefore, faced with the fact that the United States is involved in the conflict in the Gulf, which not only threatens a "major flare-up" in this region but also poses a threat to international security as a whole. Diplomatic representatives do not rule out the possibility, the American CBS television company notes, "that a storm will break."

The situation is being made more complicated by the build-up of the U.S. Navy flotilla in the Persian Gulf. In the region of the Iran-Iraq theater of war and its immediate vicinity, 15 U.S. warships are ready for action and fighter-bombers based on aircraft carriers are on alert. There have been threats that Iranian territory will be attacked if Iran tries to hinder the tanker escort. Although Washington is talking about possible defensive operations, in reality everything could take a different turn. One gets the impression that someone across the ocean is feeling tempted to carry out an operation "in the spirit of the Wild West." For example, Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger has said that, although "it is a question of responding to a sign of hostile intent, we (that is, the United States -- Yu.G.) will not wait until a strike is actually made against us." In this connection the captains of the U.S. ships have been instructed to "act decisively." They are empowered to "bring down any aircraft flying within a 50-mile radius and continuing to approach in a threatening manner," and also to "keep the sea clear of encroaching vessels within a radius of approximately 15 miles."

The atmosphere in the Gulf is also being intensified by Iran's stubborn determination to continue the war against Iraq until its victorious conclusion. At the same time, Tehran has said that it will not back down in the face of U.S. interference in the Persian Gulf. According to Tehran radio reports, Iran has begun naval maneuvers in the Persian Gulf to counteract the Pentagon's operations. The tension and general edginess are being intensified by warnings that Iranian "suicide pilots" are allegedly prepared to turn the Persian Gulf into an "American graveyard"....

One cannot fail to note that Washington began implementing its decision to provide an escort after the UN Security Council session on Monday, which unanimously called for an immediate cease-fire by Iran and Iraq and urged all other states to refrain from any actions which could lead to an escalation and expansion of the conflict. The session noted the need to display political will and prudence.

But the U.S. actions are completely out of line with these steps. This, despite the fact that there has been no shortage of statements to the effect that "the United States will not spare any effort to support a settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict." A presidential aide tried to persuade journalists at a White House briefing the other day that the Iran-Iraq conflict and the build-up of the U.S. military strike force in the Persian Gulf on the pretext of ensuring "freedom of navigation" must supposedly be regarded as "separate issues." But any unbiased observer can see that the latter threatens to make the conflict develop into an international crisis situation.

A real way out of the situation is indicated in the recent Soviet Government statement, which proposed the withdrawal from the Gulf of all warships belonging to state that have no connection with this region and urged Iran and Iraq in their turn to refrain from actions threatening international shipping. But the United States, as we can see, intends to shake the mailed fist.

Why, one asks? The answer is clear: Washington cannot give up the idea of ensuring its military diktat over the region. What is more, those across the ocean have still not abandoned the fallacy of viewing regional conflicts through the prism of superpower rivalry. Hence the incessant fabrications about some "Soviet threat" to this region.

The situation in the Persian Gulf region urgently demands a quest for political decisions to normalize the situation. This requires collective efforts by states. The preconditions now exist for joint USSR-U.S. action within the Security Council framework to bring about the earliest possible end to this prolonged conflict on just terms. Naturally, for this to happen, it is essential to avoid any dangerous, impulsive actions.

IRANIAN ENVOY IN UK LABELS MOVES 'PROVOCATION'

LD230145 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Akhunzadeh-Basti, Iranian interim charge d'affaires in the UK, has warned the U.S. of the extremely dangerous consequences of escorting Kuwaiti oil tankers in the Persian Gulf. In an interview on a BBC morning news program, he called Washington's step a risky provocation, and emphasized Iran's determination to oppose it.

IRAQ SUPPORTS UN RESOLUTION ON GULF CEASE-FIRE

LD222353 Moscow TASS in English 2344 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Baghdad July 22 TASS -- Iraq has officially supported a resolution of the U.N. Security Council demanding the immediate discontinuation of the Iranian-Iraq armed conflict and is ready to cooperate with the U.N. secretary general and the Security Council in its putting into effect.

This was stated today by an official spokesman after a joint session of the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq and the regional leadership of the Baath Party. He emphasized that the cooperation would be possible if Iran supported the resolution officially and unconditionally.

KORNILOV CONDEMNS UK SUPPORT FOR AFGHAN REBELS

LD221652 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1457 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul -- TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

A statement by the British prime minister that has appeared in the London TIMES is strange, to put it mildly. Let us quote: "We are constantly saying to the Soviet Union that as long as it continues its presence in Afghanistan there will never be real trust and friendship between our country and the Soviet Union, that the Soviet forces should be withdrawn and that a nonaligned Afghanistan would be completely to our liking."

Indeed it is no secret who unleashed the undeclared war against sovereign Afghanistan and who is acting as an energetic accomplice in organizing the armed raids on that country. Just recently, the DRA Foreign Ministry made a resolute protest over the fact that London, expanding the scope of its involvement in the war, has been providing the latest weaponry, including Blowpipe missiles, for the counterrevolutionary bands which are fighting against the DRA's legitimate government, and it quite justifiably appraised such actions as gross interference in the affairs of an independent state and a violation of generally recognized norms of international law. Speaking of Afghanistan, Mrs Thatcher preferred, for some reason, to pass over these facts in silence.

She also kept quiet about the USSR's position on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. But it is well-known that the Soviet Union is in favor of such a withdrawal being implemented and the timescale of the withdrawal being short. However, for this to happen, interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan must be stopped and its nonrenewal guaranteed -- interference which is also being actively aided by certain circles in Britain.

The policy of national reconciliation which the Afghan leadership is conducting is gradually changing the situation in the country and creating conditions for the establishment of peace in Afghanistan and the settlement of the "Afghan problem". But in London, by all appearances, they are still matching the position of those circles in the United States which are against a settlement. And, in order to mask this negative position, they are hypocritically accusing others.

ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN IN PAKISTANI PRESS REPORTED

LD222134 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] In the right-wing Pakistani press an anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet campaign has been broached. Thus, in the newspaper DAWN and the magazine (DAYBIZ) slanderous articles have been published. They contain inventions to the effect that certain agents from Moscow who aspire to split Pakistan are involved in the series of recent explosions in Karachi which had claimed numerous victims. The authors of these fabrications assert that on the territory of the Soviet Union 2,000 Afghan terrorists have allegedly undergone training to carry out acts of subversion in Pakistan. This provocative campaign whipped up with the direct connivance of the Ziaul Haq administration aspires to arouse hostility toward the Soviet Union and place new obstacles in the way of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION IN ALGERIA FOR FETE

Meets With Chairman Bitat

LD041856 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 4 Jul 87

[Text] Algiers July 4 TASS -- A Soviet delegation, led by Vice President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet S. Mukashov, here for celebrations of the 25th anniversary of Algeria's independence, was received today by Chairman of the Country's National Assembly Rabah Bitat.

They had a warm, friendly conversation during which the head of Algeria's highest legislative body stressed the importance of Soviet internationalist aid to the Algerian people in building a new society. He expressed satisfaction with the successful development of relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries, which received a new powerful impetus during last spring's friendly official visit by Algerian President Chadli Bendjedid and his talks with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Rabah Bitat hailed the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at strengthening international peace and security, promoting general and complete disarmament and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war. He also pledged Algeria's support for them.

He pointed out that the Algerian Republic follows with great interest and attention the ongoing drive to restructure and accelerate the socio-economic development of the Soviet Union.

On the same day the Soviet delegation met A. Bouhara, a member of the permanent Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Algerian National Liberation Front Party, FLN. Welcoming the members of the delegation he noted with satisfaction the consistent strengthening of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Algeria in political, economic, cultural and other fields as well as the relations between the CPSU and the FLN. Algeria's striving towards their further extension was confirmed.

Received, Greeted by Leaders

PM061215 Mosocw IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Text] Algiers, 5 Jul -- The USSR delegation headed by S. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is taking part in the celebrations to mark the 25th anniversary of Algerian independence, has had a meeting with M.C. Messaadia, member of the National Liberation Front [FLN] Politburo and head of the FLN Central Committee Permanent Secretariat.

During the warm, friendly conversation that ensued, M.C. Messaadia noted the fundamental nature of the relations which exist between Algeria and the Soviet Union and reaffirmed the determination of the Algerian leadership to develop these relations in the future in the interests of both countries and the Algerian and Soviet peoples.

He underlined Algeria's firm choice to follow a path of building socialism.

The members of the Soviet delegation talked about the restructuring process under way in the USSR and the Soviet people's warm feeling for the courageous Algerian people, who won their independence in bitter struggle and are expending every effort to comprehensively strengthen their political and economic independence and build a new, progressive Algeria.

The Soviet delegation attended a reception organized in connection with the national celebrations. During the reception the head of the USSR delegation had a conversation with Chadli Bendjedid, Algerian and FLN general secretary. He conveyed cordial greetings to the Algerian people and the leadership of the country and the FLN from the Soviet people and the Soviet leadership on this important date in Algerian history.

The Algerian president thanked him for the congratulations and extended his very best wishes to the Soviet people and the Soviet leadership.

Seen Off at Visit's Conclusion

PM131035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "End of Visit"]

[Text] Algiers, 8 Jul -- The USSR delegation headed by S. Mukashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which took part in the celebrations on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, left for home today.

Meetings and conversations took place between delegation members and M.C. Messaadia, member of the Politburo, leader of the National Liberation Front [FLN] Central Committee Permanent Secretariat; R. Bitat, chairman of the National People's Assembly, A. Bouhara, member of the FLN Central Committee Permanent Secretariat, and other leading Algerian figures, in the course of which both sides expressed the desire to further develop contacts on both state and party lines and deepen fruitful Soviet-Algerian cooperation.

The USSR delegatioan was seen off at the airport by M. Abada, member of the FLN Central Committee Permanent Secretariat; A. Abdelaoui, deputy minister of hydraulics, environment, and forests; and other officials.

SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION ARRIVES IN ZAIRE

AB142214 Kinshasa AZAP in French 1928 GMT 14 Jul 87

[Text] Kinshasa, 14 Jul (AZAP) -- A seven-member USSR Supreme Soviet parliamentary delegation led by Aleksandr Mokanu, vice president of the Presidium of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, arrived in Kinshasa today for 9-day official visit to Zaire, at the invitation of the Legislative Council.

In a statement to reporters on his arrival at Ngobila Beach, Mr Mokanu pointed out that the delegation he is leading is charged with a mission of peace and friendship and plans to discuss issues of current world concern with his Zairian counterparts. He said they will exchange views on ways of strengthening international security.

The Soviet statesman also said that during its visit the Soviet delegation will brief their interlocutors on changes taking place in the Soviet Union, especially the radical reorganization of Soviet society. The Soviet delegation will also study the activities of the Legislative Council, life, and active work of the Zairian people.

Finally, Mr Mokanu disclosed that the two sides will discuss possible strengthening of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and Zaire.

The USSR delegation was welcomed on arrival by Citizen Kassongo Mukudji, president of the Legislative Council, and by the USSR charge d'affaires in Zaire.

MOZAMBIQUE'S CHISSANO TO VISIT USSR 3-6 AUGUST

LD221334 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 22 TASS -- Joaquim Alberto Chissano, president of the People's Republic of Mozambique and chairman of the Frelimo Party, will pay an official visit of friendship to the Soviet Union on August 3 to 6 at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

CPCZ' ZAVADIL BEGINS VISIT, MEETS UNION LEADERS

Prague Reports Moscow Arrival

LD212212 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1930 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] The Soviet Union: Miroslav Zavadil, CPCZ Central Committee Secretariat member and chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions, arrived on a working visit to Moscow today. He will discuss with AUCCTU representatives further cooperation between Czechoslovak and Soviet trade union organizations.

Meets Shalayev, Medvedev

LD222209 Prague CTK in English 1956 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow July 22 (CTK correspondent) -- President of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions Stepan Shalayev held talks here today with member of the Secretariat of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee and Chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions Miroslav Zavadil.

The two representatives informed each other of the present main tasks of the Soviet and Czechoslovak trade unions and of the possibilities of increasing their cooperation.

Miroslav Zavadil, who is on a working visit to the Soviet Union, met here today also with Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Vadim Medvedev, with whom he exchanged opinions on some questions of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation.

TASS CITES PPR SPOKESMAN ON U.S. AID TO SOLIDARITY

LD221738 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Warsaw July 22 TASS -- The decision of the U.S. Congress endorsed by President Reagan to appropriate one million dollars to illegal structures of former "Solidarity" in Poland does nothing to improve Polish-American relations. Addressing a press conference here, a spokesman for the Polish Government said that by this step Washington actually admitted that anti-socialist elements in Poland are its paid agents.

The spokesman said that as a result of illegal actions of a foreign power which did so much damage to Poland, illegal "Solidarity" has officially become a paid organ which is absolutely alien to Polish life, to state interests of the Polish People's Republic.

Various "calls" to Polish authorities about agreement and cooperation with the former "Solidarity" that come from its leaders or from the West should be viewed in this context. With whom should the Polish authorities hold negotiations? We, certainly, can conduct negotiations if the U.S. Government informs us that the so-called "Provincial Council" or "Provincial Coordination Commission" of "Solidarity" are authorised to represent the United States in Warsaw, the spokesman said.

PPR'S WOZNIAK WRITES ARTICLE ON ECONOMIC REFORM

PM101535 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27, Jul 87 (Signed to Press 26 Jun 87) p 20

[Article by M. Wozniak, Politburo member and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, under the rubric "In the Countries of Socialism": "Poland: Second Stage of Economic Reform"]

[Text] This is already the 6th year that the economic reform is being implemented in Poland on the PZPR's initiative. Its chief aims were defined in the documents of the Ninth Extraordinary PZPR Congress. The directions of reform approved by the congress contain a package of economic and organizational measures to restructure the entire economic system with a view to ensuring its greater efficiency and the working people's more active involvement in management.

The economic reform is a revolution in the thinking and activity of society and provides great opportunities for self-expression by the person as the subject in the management process. At the same time, it brings with it tremendous problems of a political nature because, being closely interconnected with the entire system of improving the functioning of the socialist state, it is an important element of socialist renewal.

The essence of the reform consists in strengthening the strategic role of central planning and, at the same time, developing and strengthening the independence, self-management, and self-financing of enterprises and their responsibility for the results of their activity. These aims are served by broad application of economic instruments as well as by use of the market mechanism.

It is an extremely complex matter to assess the reform results achieved so far. At the first stage of the reform profound transformations were implemented in the legal system governing the functioning of the economy. Their scale is graphically evidenced by the adoption of 26 laws and approximately 200 various executive acts during 1982-1986. It may be said that, on the whole, conditions have been created for developing enterprises' independence and initiative, which has had a direct effect on growth of industrial output: agricultural production has increased significantly; labor productivity has increased appreciably; commodity turnover with socialist countries has increased; the materials- and energy-intensiveness of production is falling; the rich positive experience accumulated has confirmed the correctness of the basic principles of restructuring economic management.

Weaknesses and shortcomings stemming from both objective and subjective causes were bound to make themselves known in the reform process. Chief among them is the persisting imbalance in the economy, as expressed in the steady excess of demand over supply, the budget deficit, and growing debt. The causes of shortcomings also lie in difficulties with material and technical supplies — which is a consequence, in particular, of the economic "sanctions" by Western countries — and in the insufficiently consistent economic policy (it contains too many arbitrary elements and "temporary" decisions in respect to enterprises).

A decision was adopted at the 10th PZPR Congress (1986) to accelerate qualitative transformations in the economy. We are not an exception in this respect. The need to intensify the national economy and accelerate its growth has become a requirement and condition for development not only in our state but also in all socialist countries. [paragraph continues].

The nature of the economic policy being elaborated and improved has been substantially influenced by the program decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, which define the strategy of switching the economy to the path of intensification and enhancing social production efficiency. The 10th PZPR Congress confirmed most resolutely the political will to continue and develop the economic reform and enrich the forms of socialist democracy.

The chief content of the new stage of the reform, as the Third PZPR Central Committee Plenum defined it, is aimed at:

--achieving equilibrium of the consumer goods market and the supply market, of the investment market and labor resources -- which is an important condition for the efficient working of the economic mechanism;

--imparting a real nature to economic levers (prices, currency rates, interest rates, and so forth) as a condition for correct economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet], economic choice, and the functioning of the market mechanism;

--enhancing enterprises' independence, developing socialist enterprise, and, at the same time, enhancing responsibility for the results of activity;

--extending the free transfer of material and financial means between economic units and enriching enterprises' organizational forms to stimulate the processes of structural reorganization;

--more boldly differentiating the incomes of enterprises and working people according to the results of labor and the level of efficiency;

--consistently observing the principles of enterprises' self-financing and, consequently, also liquidating unprofitable units;

--further restructuring the state-legal system of economic management, particularly the "center," and adapting its organizational structure to the function of indirect leadership (strengthening economic ministries as the state's representatives in enterprises and reducing the role of ministries of a general industrial nature).

Implementing the 10th congress decisions, the Third PZPR Central Committee Plenum recommended conducting an extensive information and consultation campaign to get to know public opinion of the rate and means of restoring equilibrium, of the social consequences of this process, and also of the decisions at the second stage of the reform.

Comrade W. Jaruzelski's speech at the Economic Reform Commission session, the stand of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, Council of Ministers Chairman Z. Messner's speech in the Sejm, and, finally, the publication of the theses on the second stage of the economic reform initiated an extremely important phase of public and party debate on further directions of restructuring our economy. The main aims of the debate are:

--to consolidate in the public consciousness the party's political will to accelerate economic restructuring;

--to prepare public opinion to approve specific decisions relating to qualitative economic restructuring;

--to create a broad front of cooperation among trade union, youth, and public organizations and circles that shape public opinion in the interests of the fuller comprehensive implementation of the reform and, particularly, with a view to prompting initiative and enterprise from below;

--to enrich the substance of activity in individual directions of the second stage of the reform and to create conditions for bringing to light opinions that make it possible to make a choice that enjoys public approval.

The theses suggest solutions that embrace practically the entire system of economic functioning. They generalize the results of the Economic Reform Commission's many months of work and the experience of a wide range of scientific and practical workers. They also reflect the experience of other socialist countries in restructuring and improving their economies. They utilize the numerous remarks and suggestions contained in studies by the Polish political and public organizations.

The chief lines of the system changes proposed at the second stage of the reform are: first, the strengthening of enterprises' independence and responsibility; second, the differentiation and enrichment of enterprises' organizational forms (demonopolization, wider scope for initiative and enterprise); third, the enhancement of the role of the market mechanism in balancing the economy; and fourth, reform of the economic "center."

The enterprise's enhanced independence and responsibility require consistent observance of the principle of self-financing, as well as of the provisions of the law on improving the enterprise's economic activity and on its bankruptcy. For this it is necessary to restrict subsidies and privileges to enterprises, eliminate unprofitable enterprises, and transfer the funds released to those that work well.

Enterprises' independence does not rule out the need to employ administrative instruments of management. Their role consists in determining conditions of activity and is manifested, for example, in the form of issuing permits to import and export goods and setting quality normatives, normatives for protecting the natural environment, and normatives for the materials- and energy-intensiveness of manufacturing processes.

In 1987 it is proposed to revise agreements on associations of enterprises to eliminate producers' monopoly trends and enable enterprises to choose the bank where they want to open their account.

Large, medium, and small enterprises must function in parallel, as well as various economic associations. This applies primarily to the socialized sector, but, at the same time, it also concerns other forms of ownership, including private forms of activity in trade, public catering, services, and small-scale production. Proposals are now being discussed to set up mixed societies and companies; to sell bonds and personal shares to enterprise workers; and to extend the legal, organizational, and property independence of territorial self-management and introduce communal ownership.

Fuller utilization of market relations is to lead by 1990 to the elimination of compulsory mediation in the sale and acquisition of means of production and the abolition of regulation (with the exception of fuel and energy). It is also proposed to develop a system for the resale of foreign currency funds between enterprises in the socialized sector (at a currency rate that stimulates exports).

There are various possibilities for enhancing the significance of the economic market. Here it is possible to single out three spheres of regulation of economic processes.

The first is characterized by high capital-intensiveness and includes major production projects and service enterprises. It embraces the mining industry, power generation, fuel and raw material sectors, metallurgy, public transport, communications, municipal servcies, and so forth. In this sphere the adjusting action of the market mechanism would, naturally, be limited and unreliable. On the other hand, it is becoming possible for the "center" to regulate more accurately the influx of material means given the extensive use of the economic mechanism in the activity of internal economic units.

The second sphere is distinguished by the high degree of monopolization or the considerable imbalance of the market. The position of sole producers (for example, plants producing refrigerators or television sets) could be weakened by imports and, in the long term, by the creation of new enterprises.

The third is the typically market sphere, where contractual prices can be used. These conditions are already being met by sectors of industry such as the fruit and vegetable, glass and ceramic, and footwear sectors. This sphere could be extended, for example, to the electronics industry, production of household goods and motor vehicles, in part to the woolens, sewn goods, and hosiery industry, and also to the furniture industry and certain sectors of the food and confectionery industry.

The proposals for restructuring central organs of economic management single out the need to coordinate central structures with the logic of the economic reform. The reduction in the number of departments of the general industrial nature and the change in the role of sector ministries are aimed at ensuring that the minister represents the government in enterprises and not vice versa.

The public and party discussion of the principles and decisions of the second stage of the economic reform set forth in the theses is continuing. It is embracing widening circles. Its chief aim is to determine the public choice of variant decisions relating, for example, to the rate of achieving economic equilibrium; alternative systems for taxing enterprises; forms of income tax for the population; to ascertain opinions on innovative proposals, including ones such as the purchase of shares and bonds by individuals and the creation of a constituent fund and an enterprises fund; to formulate comments and suggestions on the choice of approach to proposed decisions, chiefly relating to questions of objective economic parameters, the principles of self-financing and, consequently, also the bankruptcy of unprofitable enterprises, and the making of economies in certain public services.

The conclusions resulting from the discussion will enrich the viewpoints of experts and be considered when finalizing the central annual plan for 1988. To conclude this phase of the campaign, there will be a Sejm session devoted to adopting the main directions, decisions, and aims of the second stage of the economic reform.

The acceleration of the organizational process is a substantial condition for implementing reform. Awareness of the significance of the organizational factor and of the fact that the economic mechanism does not ensure all the desirable actions necessary for implementing the reform formed the basis of the concept of a general review of organizational structures everywhere. [paragraph continues]

In accordance with a 10th PZPR Congress decision, the renewal and improvement of management, the rationalization of the level and structure of employment, and the limiting of manifestations of red tape are acknowledged as the chief aims of the review of the functioning of organizational structures in the economy and the state. The review is being conducted by a party and government commission. Several sections have been formed within its framework, uniting practical workers, scientists, public figures, and politicians.

The review is designed to ensure:

--improvement of the management system and, above all, of organizational structures at all levels;

--the coordination of organizational structures with the demands made by the economic reform, particularly those concerning the enhancement of efficiency;

--support for other measures aimed at improving the functioning of enterprises, that is, at regularizing their internal documentation and the exchange of information, adopting decisions, strengthening internal economic accountability, improving organization, introducing the team contract, and so forth.

--the improvement of services for citizens in all spheres by local management organs, economic organizations, public establishments, and service enterprises in production and superstructure;

--the exposure of superfluous structures, inordinately swollen staffs, and their incorrect proportions and the creation of conditions for making rational use of the reserves revealed.

To ensure that the review embraces the economic structure more fully, the government has begun work on the univeral certification of workplaces in enterprises and establishments. We are using as an example the already proven experience of certification carried out in the USSR and the GDR.

There is no need to demonstrate that the reform's success depends on public understanding of its aims and methods. Only on this condition is it possible to count on its efficient introduction and on support from all working people and organizations.

The reform will be a hard test of political maturity, above all for party organizations, particularly at enterprises, and a test of political leadership of the restructuring of the economic mechanism. The future of socialist Poland will depend on its results.

The need to intensify the national economy and accelerate its qualitative transformations has become the requirement and the condition for developing not only our state but also all the socialist community countries. The experience of other socialist countries, and of the USSR above all, shows that it is impossible to turn from this path. On the contrary, it is necessary to develop and accelerate work connected with the radical restructuring of economic mechanisms and organizational-legal structures within the framework of the socialist community.

BRITAIN MAKES STATEMENT ON WEAPONS USE IN GULF

LD211256 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0832 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] London, 12 Jul [date as received] [TASS] -- George Younger, British secretrary of state for defense, said that British warships in the Persian Gulf have received instructions to use weapons as a "measure of self-defense" against any attempted attack on them or on cargo ships sailing in these waters under the British flag. In this way, Britain has virtually acknowledged that it intends to conduct the same policy of sabre-rattling in the region as its senior partner, the United States. Two British combat vessels are now carrying out "patrol duty" in the zone of the Persian Gulf. Another three ships of the British navy are enroute to the area.

UK SUPPORT OF U.S. GULF POLICY CRITICIZED

PM211023 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jul 87 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Goryainov "Rejoinder": "Flattery and Incitement"]

[Text] "If we want the free world to prosper, then it is extremely important that the United States demonstrates the leading role which befits it." These are the words of British Prime Minister M. Thatcher.

It is difficult to determine what there is more of here -- flattery or incitement. There is enough of both, evidently. But the whole point is when these words were pronounced. They were uttered at a moment when Washington desperately needs approving assessments from abroad which it can adduce as "international support" for its actions in the Persian Gulf.

It is not very surprising that the Tory cabinet has supported Washington in further intensifying its military presence in this explosive region. Rather the opposite. How could it fail to support an ally and protector which is always ready, as practice shows, to lend a hand in token of past and future friendship. Didn't the White House take London's side during the Anglo-Argentine military conflict?

But, of course, it is not just a matter of people in the British Isles being mindful of the need to repay a debt. Much more fundamental is the fact that the neoglobalist policy pursued by the United States in different parts of the world effectively coincides with the British ruling circles' aspirations. Particularly where the Persian Gulf is concerned.

Even in ancient Rome they used to say that it is wrong to judge in haste. This wise saying was a warning to the rulers of the empire against taking precipitate steps. A great historical distance separates us from the Roman epoch. But even today it would do certain people no harm to reflect on this aphorism -- both those who lightly move armadas around as if they were playing a child's game of battleships, and those who fawn in agreement in the hope of deriving political gain from a military conflict unleashed by others.

U.S. CLAIMS OF GREEK LINKS WITH TERRORISM DENIED

PM101303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Potapov dispatch: "Calculations and Miscalculations. U.S. Pressure Elicits a Resolute Greek Protest"]

[Text] Athens, July -- "Many aspects of this matter require study, while others require discussion through diplomatic channels. I do not want to discuss this," Charles Redman, official spokesman for the U.S. State Department, declared recently.

What kind of topic is it which the U.S. spokesman did not venture to touch on almost a week after events which, according to the local press, created serious complications in Greek-U.S. relations?

Let us take things in their proper order. On 25 June the car of R. Keeley, U.S. ambassador to Greece, sped along one of the capital's chief arteries -- Eleftherios Venizelos Avenue. The ambassador was driving to a meeting, scheduled at his request, with K. Papoulias, the country's foreign minister. Immediately after the meeting the only possible comment was that Keeley's unexpected move had bewildered and exasperated the Greek side. At the time the head of the Greek foreign policy department called the U.S. ambassador's allegations "absurd, groundless, slanderous, and suspicious."

The essence of those allegations did not remain top secret for long. THE NEW YORK TIMES soon shared with its readers the fact that Washington had accused Athens of having contacts with international terrorist organizations! The sensation went around the world.

What was this -- another "accidental" leak of information? Perhaps it really is just a question of the U.S. "usual practice" of exchanging information with its allies within the framework of efforts to combat terrorism, as R. Ridgway, the Washington specialist on European problems, tried to protray it? Local political analysts believe, however, that if this was another leak of information, it was far from accidental.

So, the charges brought by R. Keeley, the planting of "reports" of notorious Greek ties with terrorists for exaggeration in the news media of various countries... All these are components of a provocative action against Greece and its leadership. It is not only aimed at undermining Greece's prestige and authority in the world, which are growing thanks to its peace-loving efforts, and sowing suspicion and mistrust toward this southern Balkan country. It is also designed to create additional difficulties for Greece in the economic sphere: to undermine its tourist business, which represents a substantial source of revenue.

One wonders who will travel to a "haven of terrorism"? This canard was also launched. While making rather clumsy attempts to reduce the intensity of passions, nevertheless Washington is in no hurry to retract its allegations "officially and publicly," as the Greek side reasonably demands. Agitated public opinion in the West can only guess at what is keeping the U.S. authorities from that step. This being so, the press suggests, if anyone had any intention of vacationing in Greece, he has something to think about and should refrain from doing so...

This is not the first time the U.S. Administration has resorted to such ruses. The year before last it publicly voiced "doubts" about safety at Greek airports. The aim was achieved -- fewer American tourists. Only recently the Greek political-economic journal GREEK FORUM was able to point out optimistically that, according to forecasts, the number of visitors from the other side of the ocean would increase 20 percent this year compared with last. And then Keeley made his move.

My Greek colleagues point out that in the economic sphere such U.S. actions are akin to Washington's favorite policy of sanctions, which has been placed at the service of achieving U.S. military-political aspirations in various parts of the world.

The United States is using methods of blackmail and pressure with regard to Greece to try to make it more compliant on the question of American military bases. As is known, the term of their location on Greek soil expires next year. As the Greek-U.S. bases agreement draws to an end, a strong nationwide movement is mounting in the country for the elimination of U.S. military installations on Greek territory. Athens' stand on the question of disarmament and the adherence of this country's leadership to the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the region and turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace are well known on the other side of the ocean. And the fate of their military strongpoints in the Balkans is already creating headaches for strategists on the banks of the Potomac...

The first reaction of A. Papandreou, Greek head of government, to the development of events became known from his statement to journalists on board his aircraft en route to Brussels for the European Council session at the level of heads of state and government. The United States is mistaken, he declared, if it thinks that Greece will yield to pressure and blackmail and sign the bases treaty. "Almost 6 years into our leadership," the prime minister pointed out, "it is high time it knew that blackmail attempts are futile."

Greece is continuing to demand a public U.S. retraction of the farfetched accusations against it and rejects other options for "defusing the situation." It is directly pointed out here that from the moment of the meeting between R. Keeley and K. Papoulias the substance of their talks became the object of various kinds of commentaries not only in the U.S. press. "The matter remains open for us," A. Panpandreou emphasized. "Our position is unbending."

COMMERCE MINISTER SIGNS AGREEMENT WITH USSR

For an Athens Radio report of an agreement and contracts signed on 16 July in Athens between Minister of Commerce Panayiotis Roumeliotis, Yuriy Nikolayevich Chumakov, deputy minister of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade, and Suren Yefremovich Sarukhanov, deputy minister of the Soviet Ministry of Trade, see the Greece section of the 17 July Western Europe DAILY REPORT.

FRG'S WOERNER PLANS MISSILE 'MODERNIZATION'

PM161257 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jul 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the "What the Papers Say" rubric: "M. Woerner's Missile Plans]

[Texdt] The latest issue of the influential West German magazine STERN carries an article exposing FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner's missile modernization plans.

The article says, among other things, that while the great powers are drawing closer and closer to disarmament in the nuclear sphere, Defense Minister Woerner is planning to employ a new generation of medium-range missiles.

"Air Force Commander Eberhard Eimler," the magazine points out, "keeps an explosive document under lock and key: His safe contains the 'tactical requirements' of the next model of those same West German Pershing-1A missiles which are causing so many disputes between East and West in the disarmament struggle. Officially, Bonn is still thinking about it, but preparatory work to create the new system has been in full swing since at least 1985.

"While Moscow and Washington are discussing disarmament at the negotiating table Defense Minister Woerner has shed his mask in the draft treaty with the Americans. While formerly supporters of missiles on both sides of the Atlantic constantly sought to disguise their craving for those weapons with soothing references to the siting of allegedly defensive weapons, the draft treaty now specifically points out precisely what is involved in the still-secret missile plan: missiles with conventional warheads capable of hitting enemy airfields."

The article goes on to note that "A timetable was mapped out in the Federal Security Council, one of the most secret bodies in the Federal capital, on 24 July 1985. The meeting participants approved (what was conspiratorially called) a 'long-term technological and experimental program in the sphere of high-risk ballistic missile system technologies designed to hit a wide range of targets using conventional armaments.' In a strictly confidential 'ministerial circular' of 7 October 1985 Lothar Ruehl, state secretary in the Defense Ministry, left no doubt as to what the modification of the Pershing-1A system involved. As Ruehl pointed out in the circular, the new system must have a range of 700-800 km and be manufactured, with the participation of German industry, by 1991 (when the Pershing 1-A missiles are due to be decommissioned).

"Woerner wants to site new short-range missiles. This is put as follows in the latest circular: The inspector general of the Bundeswehr (initially Woflgang Altenburg, now Dieter Wellershoff) must take care to ensure the retention of the Lance system and also adopt a definite position in the need and potential for subsequent modification. The range of the Lance battlefield missiles is around 120 km. The next system, however, is to have a range of up to 320 km. The targets of this new generation of missiles being developed at Woerner's wish are thus quite clear: The GDR, western Poland, and the CSSR."

In conclusion STERN stresses that a propos the Soviet-U.S. talks, "Franz Joseph Strauss, chairman of the Christian Social Union, now admits defeat. The 'deal' struck between the great powers in the disarmament sphere will hardly come unstuck because of opponents in Germany. However, this defensive fire is quite capable of delaying things. True, this does not bother Woerner. He has always demanded the replacement of the medium-range missile destined for scrapping with a 'system of similar deterrent effect.'"

MEXICAN SENATE DELEGATION VISITS SUPREME SOVIET

PA170508 Mexico City EL DIA in Spanish 8 Jul 87 pp 1, 2

[Excerpts] Moscow, 7 Jul -- Referring to the common opinions that Mexico and the Soviet Union share concerning international issues, Mexican Senate leader Antonio Riva Palacio Lopez added that he hopes that the Mexican delegation discusses things in depth with their Soviet counterparts so that recommendations to the presidents of the corresponding governments can be made.

Upon his arrival at the Supreme Soviet, Riva Palacio was greeted by Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet Council of Nationalities. At that ceremony, Riva Palacio said that identification between Mexico and the USSR originates in the fact that both nations are the product of this century's first revolutions and that "through different routes and in accordance with the historical situations of the two countries, both Mexico and the USSR have been pioneer nations in the political and social transformations that have been validated in this century."

Senator Socorro Diaz stressed that "Mexico and the Soviet Union agree on important issues regarding disarmament. The peoples and the governments of Mexico and the USSR agree on struggling against the arms race and especially against its extension to space."

She stated that "we think it is important to create a culture of peace, because a war begins in man's mind and heart; therefore, all governments should use formal and informal education; in other words, use the mass media to promote the concept of peace and understanding among men and to discourage feelings of exclusiveness."

Senator Diaz pointed out that "because we have been repeatedly attacked through history, we believe in a kind of nationalism that is neither hostile nor exclusive." [passage omitted]

Along with Socorro Diaz of the senate's editorial commission, the other Mexican senators who met with the Soviet legislators are: Gilberto Munoz Mosqueda of the communications and transport commission, Raul Salinas Lozano of the trade commission, and PRI Deputies Jesus Siller and Mario Murillo and PSUM [United Socialist Party of Mexico] Deputy Arturo Whaley. [passage omitted]

At the Supreme Soviet, which is composed of 1,500 deputies of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the Mexican parliamentarians were met by Avgust Voss, the chairman of both Soviets, who explained that the Soviets not only have legislative functions, but also executive and verification functions. [passage omitted]

The president of the delegation invited his Soviet colleagues to visit Mexico early next year, and they accepted at once.

Roal'd Sagdeyev, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and a specialist in modern weapons, spoke against the militarization of space.

He said that his country has proposed the use of outer space to aid in the development of poor countries. He said that the satellite launching facilities are at the disposal of any nation that wants to use them free of charge, on the condition that they are not used for warlike purposes. [passage omitted]

Senator Socorro Diaz spoke in favor of establishing free areas [not further specified] devoted to investigating the use of outer space for peaceful means. [passage omitted] She asked for help from the World Peace Fund. It is of the utmost importance to implement an economy of peace, because it is shocking to realize that there are educated, intelligent people who affirm that if the war economy were to be changed to a peace economy the economies of many countries would collapse.

Countries such as Japan and the FRG transformed their war economies into the production of consumer goods. "They are the ones winning the economic war," concluded the Mexican senator.

In his brief answer, Yevgeniy Primakov, deputy and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said that his country is willing to allow the verification of its arsenals. He reiterated that proposals to end the space race will be supported and concluded that national security affects not only geographic and military areas, but also social, economic, and developmental aspects. [passage omitted]

CPSU DELEGATION RECEIVED BY BRAZILIAN SENATOR

PM211621 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit to Brasilia"]

[Text] Brasilia, 18 Jul -- The CPSU delegation led by G.P. Bogomyakov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, and first secretary of the Tyumen CPSU Okom, which is taking part in the work of the Eighth Brazilian Communist Party (PCB) Congress, was received yesterday by Humberto Lucena, president of the Brazilian National Congress and senator from the ruling Party of the Brazilian Democratic Movement (PMDB). During the conversation, he expressed satisfaction with the fact that the first legal PCB Congress -- the PCB is a long-standing ally of the PMDB in the struggle for democratic changes in Brazil -- is being held at this time, under the civilian government of President Jose Sarney, the honored chairman of the PMDB.

The president of the National Congress noted the great interest with which various Brazilian political circles and the Brazilian public are following the changes in the Soviet Union and stressed that the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state and especially the efforts aimed at preventing a nuclear conflict have sympathy and support in Brazil. Both sides were unanimous in the opinion that Brazil and the USSR have considerable potential for broader cooperation in various spheres.

BRIEFS

NEW AMBASSADOR TO COLOMBIA -- Moscow, 17 Jul (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Valeriy Nikolayenko ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the Republic of Colombia. Valeriy Nikolayenko was born in 1941. A candidate of historical sciences, he has been in diplomatic work since 1964 and held a number of executive posts in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and abroad. From 1975 to 1979 he was first secretary of the Soviet Embassy in the United States. From 1981 to 1987 he was deputy head of the First Latin American Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Leonid Romanov from his duties as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the Republic of Colombia in connection with his transfer to other work. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0855 GMT 17 Jul 87 LD]

POLITICAL & SOCIAL

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE CRITICIZES KUYBYSHEV OBLAST

LD211841 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has examined the work of party, administrative, and economic organs of Kuybyshev Oblast on the preparation for the coming fall-winter period by construction and transportation enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and municipal services.

The adopted resolution notes that serious shortcomings were committed in Kuybyshev Oblast's preparation for the past winter season. Power and other main services are in a neglected condition. Heating systems broke down, transportation work was disrupted, energy supplies to agriculture were disrupted, and the lag in January and February's industrial production has still not been made up.

The CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the Kuybyshev Obkom Buro, the Oblispolkim, the oblast ispolkom, and personally of Comrade Muraviev, first secretary of the party obkom, and Comrade Pogodin, chairman of the oblast ispolkom, to the intolerable slowness in the implementation of work to prepare the national economy for the fall-winter period, and have demanded that they take exhausitve measures to eliminate the shortages.

KHITRUN ELECTED RYAZAN OBKOM FIRST SECRETARY

LD181426 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Jul 87

[Text] A plenum of the Ryazan obkom which was held today examined an organizational matter. Comrade Khitrun, who has been working as USSR minister of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, was elected first secretary of the obkom.

SHCHERBITSKIY ATTENDS KIEV OBKOM PLENUM

LD222324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] The tasks of the party organizations of Kiev Oblast in implementing the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum on the radical restructuring of the management of the economy were profoundly and comprehensively discussed at a plenum of the party obkom.

Comrade Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, spoke at the plenum. The plenum approved the concrete organizational and political measures of the party obkom in fulfilling the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum which were discussed on a preliminary basis in the oblast's party committees.

PRAVDA CITES CRITICISM OF UKRAINE 'UPPER ECHELON'

PM230901 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 87 Second Edition p 2

[Report on Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov under the general headline: "Communists Discussing the Decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. Time for Concrete Action"]

[Text] Kiev -- As has been reported, a Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum has discussed the republic party organizations' tasks in implementing the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum decisions on radically restructuring economic management. The keynote speaker, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary and those who contributed to the debate noted a number of positive changes: Fuller use is now being made in the republic of intensive factors and of the achievements of scientific and technical progress. Work on revamping and retooling production is becoming more extensive. Enterprises and associations are switching to multishift operation. Agricultural production has increased.

It is characteristic that the growth rates of national income and labor productivity have increased by 30 percent since the beginning of the current 5-year plan; the increase is 60 percent in the case of profits, and the entire increase in national income is due to higher labor productivity. It was noted that the 6-month plan for industrial output was fulfilled and plans for purchases of livestock and poultry and milk and eggs were overfulfilled.

But, as Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom First Secretaries V. Ivashko of Dnepropetrovsk, G. Revenko of Kiev, and Ya. Pogrebnyak of Lvov; V. Yevsyukov, party committee secretary at the Kirov metallurgical combine in Makeyevka; and N. Gurov, director of the Ilich combine in Zhdanov, said, considerably less has been done in the republic than might and should have been done. In a number of sectors positive trends did not acquire stability. Many enterprises in machine building, ferrous metallurgy, and the chemical, petroleum refining and petrochemical, light, and local industries failed to make up the ground they had lost during the winter months. One industrial collective in four failed to meet contract pledges on deliveries, one in six failed to meet labor productivity targets, and nearly one in three failed to fulfill profit plans. The proportion of top-quality category articles was smaller than last year.

The causes of errors in economic management have been analyzed more than once at Central Committee plenums and resolutions have been adopted. But they have not been backed up by the requisite practical work, which resulted in omissions. And the Secretariat, Central Committee departments, and local party committees failed to ensure effective monitoring of the implementation of plans. The Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers bears a large part of the responsibility. It was noted at the plenum that the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has not always held republic and oblast leaders properly accountable for shortcomings and failures and has sometimes failed to tackle urgent care matters promptly.

"Upper-echelon leaders' responsibility for shortcomings has been played down," K. Masik, first secretary of Kiev party gorkom, said.

It must be clear to everyone, the speakers noted, that the main thing now is to waste not a single day in acting vigorously and increasing efforts in the accomplishment of the tasks. Mention was made of the work of Donetsk and Zhitomir Obkoms and Kiev party obkom and gorkom, which are seeking new approaches in the leadership of socioeconomic development. [paragraph continues]

In the Dnepropetrovsk, Poltava, and Khmelnitskiy Oblast party organizations purposeful assistance is being given to laggard collectives.

Unfortunately, speakers stated, many party committees have not only failed to take charge of restructuring, but are extremely slow to restructure themselves. This is graphically manifested in the work style and methods of Zaporozhye party obkom. There have been no marked changes for the better in the oblast in leading production sectors and capital construction. The party obkom bureau, having failed to assess the situation self-critically, is dissipating energies on the resolution of economic questions but is failing to thoroughly analyze cadre problems and the causes of stagnation phenomena. Restructuring is making halting progress in Vinnitsa, Nikolayev, Odessa, and Rovno Oblasts as well.

In the Kharkov city party organization more than one-half of the scientific research institutes and design bureaus in the machine building sphere last year failed to come up with a single development of world standard. Cadres are not made properly accountable and their work is not properly supervised. And, clearly, it is no coincidence that in this atmosphere of irresponsibility a gang of swindlers was active over a long period in the city's consumer services sphere. The Central Committee made it incumbent on the party obkom and First Secretary V. Mysnichenko to establish order in the city and aid the gorkom.

An inability to live and work in conditions of democracy or simply a fear of democratic changes have been apparent in the activity of a number of party committees in Ivan-Frankovsk Oblast, which are failing to ensure the proper development of openness. The party obkom secretaries and bureau members themselves are failing to set an example of developing criticism and self-criticism. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo heard an obkom report and drew the attention of the obkom bureau and of its first secretary, I. Postoronko, to the sluggish implementation of the party's guidelines.

The plenum participants devoted a great deal of attention to the accomplishment of priority tasks -- providing the population with food, housing, and consumer goods and services. P. Zayvyy, chairman of the kolkhoz named for the 25th CPSU Congress in Kirovograd Oblast, V. Sheptun, lathe operator at the "Zhivmash" plant in Priluki, Chernigov Oblast, and others pointed out that there is great potential for substantially altering the situation. But the stagnation has not been overcome. The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum sharply and fairly criticized Vinnitsa, Kirovograd, and Nikolayev Oblasts for unsatisfactorily tackling food tasks. The situation is no better in Odessa Oblast. A comparison was cited. In Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, and Crimean Oblasts around 150 quintals of meat are produced per 100 hectares of land, but in Kirovograd, Nikilayev, and Odessa Oblasts the figure is only 102-117 quintals. In recent years they have been bringing cabbages, carrots, tomatoes, and onions to Vinnitsa and Kirovograd from other oblasts. The Odessans, despite having 216,000 irrigated hectares, are buying vegetables not only from neighboring Moldavia, but even from Lithuania. The plenum demanded that party obkom First Secretaries L. Krivoruchko, N. Samilyk, L. Sharayev, and A. Nochevkin and oblispolkom Chairmen N. Didyk, V. Zheliba, V. Ilin, and A. Pecherov get down to restructuring not in words, but in practice.

Speakers provided a detailed analysis of progress in the accomplishment of a most important social task -- providing practically every family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000. In the current 5-year plan housing construction will increase by at least 10 percent compared with the plan. But Transcarpathian, Chernigov, and Kherson Oblasts are regularly failing to assimilate the funds allocated for housing.

Work on improving supplies of consumer goods and developing the services sphere was deemed unsatisfactory. The Ministry of Light Industry, the Ministry of Local Industry, the Ministry of Consumer Services, and the Ukrainian SSR Union of Consumers Societies and enterprises in many oblasts and in Kiev city have failed to provide even in plans for achieving the Comprehensive Program's targets at the end of the first 2 years of the 5-year plan. In this connection serious criticism was leveled at many republic ministers and at Ye. Kachalovskiy, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers.

National economic management requires radical restructuring. It was stressed that it is important to take fully into account the experience of enterprises already operating in conditions of full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. There are around 500 of these collectives in the republic. For example, good results were achieved by the following associations: the "Krasnoarmeyskugol" in Donetsk Oblast, the "Dnepropetrovskiy Kombaynovyy Zavod Imeni K. Voroshilov," the "Konveyer" (Lvov), the "Abrazivnyy Kombinat" (Zaporozhye), and the "Kiyevtraktorodetal." But one in three enterprises switched to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing is still failing to fulfill the plan for contract deliveries. They are being prevented from achieving a higher standard of management primarily by parasitism, selfishness, diffidence, and a lack of competence on the part of cadres.

The plenum also said that the structure of many ministries and departments remains complex. Their activity is dominated by bureaucratic administration, which results in intolerable interference in the affairs of labor collectives and gives rise to red tape. Work is being done in the republic to improve organizational structures and reduce the management apparatus. It has been cut by 78,000 people. But the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Local Industry has prepared proposals on restructuring whose implementation will require a 50-percent increase in the ministry apparatus (!).

The speakers clearly voiced the opinion that all working people must be made aware of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum decisions. It is important to explain thoroughly and convincingly to people the essential nature and principles of restructuring and to use specific examples to demonstrate what is already being done and what has to be done to implement it.

We are launching, it was said at the plenum, truly revolutionary work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum decisions in the year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. And we are right to see it as a direct continuation and development of the transformations initiated by October.

DISSIDENT SKOBOV REPORTEDLY FREED IN LENINGRAD

AU211306 Paris AFP in English 1218 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] Munich, West Germany, July 21 (AFP) -- Soviet dissident Aleksandr Skobov has been released from a Leningrad psychiatric hospital, according to a statement here on Tuesday by the campaign group USSR News Brief.

The group, which campaigns for human rights in the Eastern bloc, said Mr Skobov was freed on July 17.

He was one of the leaders of the independent Soviet trade union GMOT, a member of the Young Marxists group and a publisher of the underground magazine 'ALTERNATIVE,' the group said.

AUTHOR AKHMETOV EXPECTED TO IMMIGRATE TO WEST

LD221126 Hamburg DPA in German 1032 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Excerpt] Frankfurt (DPA) -- Bashkirian author Nisametin Akhmetov, who has spent 20 years in Soviet prisons and psychiatric hospitals, is to leave the USSR on Thursday and to be able to immigrate to the West. In a statement today, the International Society for Human Rights in Frankfurt said it has learned this from Moscow human rights circles. It is anticipated that the 39-year-old will come to the Federal Republic. [passage omitted]

COURT BACKS UNION AGAINST PLANT DIRECTOR

LD221750 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] Kiev July 22 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya:

The director of the "Industriya" plant in Chernovtsiy, western Ukraine, has lost the case he initiated against the plant's trade union.

The court took the side of the trade union in the labour dispute, found Petr Vorobey's actions unlawful and demanded that the branch ministry reprimand him.

The dispute arose after a plant engineer used his right to a one-day leave for personal reasons. The director regarded the leave as an unauthorised absence from work and reprimanded him.

The trade union committee overruled the decision as unfounded. Then Vorobey, keen on having his own way, started legal action against the committee.

"Courts have started to cut short attempts by some administration to exert pressure on trade unions. We see that trade union committees, too, are showing more courage in defending working people's rights", Nikolay Nikitenko, legal inspector of the Ukrainian Trade Union Council, told TASS.

Nikitenko said that trade unions had wide powers to this score before, too. For example, under Article 45 of the code of labour laws of the Ukraine trade unions can demand that a plant manager or some other administrator be removed from work for unlawful actions.

However, trade unions did not use this right often in practice. Now the situation has changed. Recently, the chief engineer of a plant in Voroshilovgrad, Grigoriy Poyda, was dismissed from his job for ignoring demands for improved labour protection.

"Still, these example are rather exceptions. As a rule, management coordinate all their actions with trade unions. The Law on the State Enterprise, passed recently by Soviet parliament, has made such coordination stricter", Nikitenko said.

LUKYANOV ADDRESSES CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

PM211511 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 29, 19 Jul 87 p 12

["Summary of report" by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Anatoliy Lukyanov to 15-17 June conference on "Development of the Socialist Constitutional System" in Moscow: "More Democracy, More Socialism" -- first paragraph is unattributed introduction]

[Text] MN No 26, 1987, carried an item on the work of an international conference "Development of the Socialist Constitutional System". Foreign readers are still sending us letters asking for more information about the materials of the conference. In a desire to grant these requests MN has decided to publish a detailed summary of the report delivered to scholars from the USSR and other countries at the conference that took place in Moscow on June 15-17 by Anatoliy Lukyanov, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A hallmark of the development of the Soviet socialist system — since the victory of the October Revolution till our days — has been the constant search for the most effective ways and means of ensuring the full sovereignty of the working people, the gist of which boils down to the government of the people by the people themselves, i.e., to the people's self-government in its Marxist understanding.

Lenin clearly saw the perspective of a transition to genuine people's self-management already on the eve of the October Revolution. He believed that it was inseparable from the working people winning political power and constituted their fullest participation in management.

Moreover, Lenin did not counterpose this participation of the masses and their self-management to the state of the working people but, conversely, conceived it as its main content. This meant that the Soviet form of people's self-management could under no circumstances be squeezed into the narrow framework of "local self-government" which existed in the capitalist state. Not as petty communal affairs, not as an appendage to state power, but as this power itself, built on the basis of the working people's active and mass involvement in the affairs of the state, on their self-management -- this is how Lenin visualized the Republic of Soviets.

Now that we are approaching the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, it is safe to say that the political forecast of the leader of our Revolution has been fully borne out by history. Of course, our path of developing every aspect of the working people's full sovereignty has been neither simple nor easy because it was the path of pioneers. There have been ups and downs, victories and setbacks, discoveries and errors. But on the whole, as we made further headway, as we built the foundations of socialism, strengthened and deepened the socialist principles of Soviet society's life, ever broader strata of the population necessarily became involved in running the country, seeing this as their vital cause. All of this was reflected in the first, 1918, Constitution of the Russian Federation and the Constitutions of the other Soviet Republics, in the 1924 Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and then in the USSR Constitution adopted in December 1936. They formalized the consistent expansion of the social basis of the socialist state, the transformation of the Soviet Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies into the Soviets of Working People's Deputies, and the gradual advance of socialist worker-peasant self-management towards the self-management of all working people, the entire nation.

On the other hand, these constitutional acts inevitably reflected the conditions and specific features of the stages of history we had traversed: war communism and the New Economic Policy, industrialization and collectivization, as well as profound changes in the people's cultural life. In that far from easy period our country, which was by far not the most developed economically, found itself face to face with the capitalist world. It had to muster all its forces to quickly overcome its technical and economic backwardness, carry out dramatic changes in the economy, and direct in a centralized way vast resources primarily into the development of heavy industry. This purpose was served by the centralized system of state management, making it desirable in the shortest possible time to carry through such strategic objectives which took whole decades to complete for developed capitalist nations. The centralized character of management inevitably intensified in the period of the Great Patriotic War. It was preserved more or less in the postwar years as well. All these are the objective realities of our history.

At the same time, as years went by, the established system of management increasingly entered into a contradiction with the conditions and requirements of economic and social development, and with society's advance along the socialist path. The 1977 Constitution of the USSR formalized the complete and final victory of socialism, which ensured the gradual transition of the state of the dictatorship of the working class into a state of the whole people, thus making it possible to effect new and considerable changes in mastering the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, in going over from extensive to intensive methods of economic management, and in implementing the principle in accordance with which state power must not only be exercised in the interests of the people, but also increasingly become the vital cause of the people themselves, of every working man and woman.

However, this was hampered by the stagnation phenomena which occurred on the brink of the 1970s and 1980s. There emerged discrepancies between the Constitution and social practice, serious malfunctions in the mechanism of economic management, and retreats from the principles of social justice. Formalism and preorganization in involving the working people in running the country became widespread. The statistics of meetings came to replace actual work. Serious shortcomings also piled up in the functioning of the institutions of socialist democracy, in the practical work of the soviets, in the style and methods of management.

Such being the case, the problem arose in all its magnitude of achieving a sharp turn in the development of all institutions of the Soviet state, and restoring their democratic potential. This was stated with utter frankness, straightforwardness and courage at the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 27th Party Congress and at subsequent Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee. Moreover, an accurate and clearcut definition was given to the lever which would ensure the irreversibility of perestroika, and to include the decisive force -- the people -- in it. The Party sees this lever in the democratization of every aspect of society's life.

First and foremost, the question here is of enhancing the role of representative bodies of power at all levels -- the Soviets of People's Deputies. Today the Soviets comprise 52,000 bodies of state power in the centre and in the localities. They unite upwards of two million deputies of more than 100 nationalities, representing all classes and social groups of our society. In the present-day conditions special significance is attachd to persistent efforts to overcome the contradiction between the powers at the disposal of the Soviets and the manner in which these powers are being used. Let us put it bluntly, the gap here is still considerable. What are the ways of fulfilling this task?

First, it is the extension of the powers of the Soviets in tackling political and socio-economic problems and the active use of these powers in the comprehensive development of the territory. On the whole, the task is for each Soviet to become in fact the epicentre where all the main questions of the development of the corresponding territory, every person's and every family's life and everyday problems are solved.

Second, a major factor in enhancing the role of the Supreme and local Soviets is the democratization of their formation and activities (modifying the electoral system, responsibility and accountability of administrative bodies, improving the procedure of holding sessions, the work of standing commissions and the activities of deputies).

In improving the work of the Soviets there are truths which must be used primarily as markers. The Soviet is the master of the territory, and the deputies to the Soviet are masters in it. It is through their activization that the general line in the development of our state's democratic institutions passes.

The position of the working people's public organizations in our constitutional system has been defined anew today in many respects. The recently held congresses of the trade unions, the Komsomol, the creative unions and veterans have provided a fresh impetus to improving the work of these and many other social formations. Today measures are being drawn up to expand the range of questions which state bodies can handle only with the participation or preliminary consent of the corresponding trade union, Komsomol and women's organizations, as well as to invest these organizations with the right to suspend fulfilment of managerial decisions in a number of cases.

On the other hand, the identification of the Soviets as the main unit of socialist self-management and the promotion of the activities of public organizations should under no circumstances be understood as an underestimation of the forms of citizens' direct participation in running the country. In principle both these concepts -- representative and direct democracy - are inseparable from each other. A special role in this is played by the practice, asserted in our country, of broad public discussions of draft laws and other major decisions of the nationwide, Republican and local character, which is now being formalized in the Law on Nationwide Discussion of Key Issues of State Life.

Direct democracy is acquiring an ever greater scope in the life of work collectives. Their meetings are annually addressed by some 80 million people. The Party has set the task of broadening step by step the range of problems on which the decisions of the work collectives are final, and enhancing the role of general meetings of industrial and office workers. All of this has found reflection, notably, in the new Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

In short, the principles of the people's socialist self-management have been penetrating deeper and deeper into economic life. In decisive measure this has to be assisted by the radical restructuring of economic management projected by the Party. First and foremost, it envisages a transition from predominantly administrative to predominantly economic methods of leadership, to the broad democratization of management, and the revitalizing of the human factor.

But perestroyka concerns not only the bodies running the economy. It also fully applies to all other institutions of the state, including the entire totality of bodies linked to the provision of legality, law and order. Moreover, the questions of strengthening socialist legality are being advanced today to one of the top places inasmuch as genuine democracy does not exist outside the law and above the law.

The 27th Party Congress defined the main orientation in developing legislation and strengthening law and order. Today a large amount of work is being unfolded to draft and adopt new laws linked to the development of the economy, the social sphere and culture, the people's socialist self-management, and broader guarantee of the citizens' rights and liberties. In short, the legal basis of perestroyka and its legal provision are being set up.

But however good the adopted law may be, it lives on only when it is strictly observed and applied. In this context exceptional significance in the present-day conditions is attached to improving the work of the law-enforcement bodies. The party demands that those who serve the cause of law and order should be themselves crystal-clear in face of the law, the state and the people. It should always be remembered that breaches of legality and mistakes in the activities of law-enforcement bodies are most painfully perceived by the working people. They do immense political harm, since they emanate from those who must themselves defend the interests of the state and act on behalf of Soviet power.

Challenging tasks arise primarily before the courts. In restructuring the work of the judicial system, it is borne in mind that the prestige of the court as an elective body standing the closest to the population must be enhanced, that the legality and competitiveness in administrating justice must be strengthened, and the strict implementation of the principle of independence of the judges must be ensured.

Recently the CPSU Central Committee passed a detailed resolution on drastically improving the activities of the Procurator's Office. The centre of gravity in its work must be shifted to supervision over how officials fulfill their duties in observing the laws, to the timely identification and prevention of instances of violations of legality. The task has been set to considerably raise the level of work of the Procurator's Office in defending the rights and legitimate interests of citizens so as to conduct an even more vigorous struggle against the suppression of citicism, and against everything that hinders perestroyka and the moral improvement of society.

A special place in the development of the Soviet system is held by the realization of the well-known provision of Lenin's in accordance with which socialism is called upon to ensure "full well-being and free, all-round development for all the members of society". From the outset socialism distinguished itself by having introduced in the Constitution and constantly expanded the socio-economic rights of citizens. This is a fundamental gain of the revolution. At the same time the Soviet state devotes close attention to people's political and personal liberties as well. In this case it is borne in mind that all categories of rights and liberties are important and necessary to ensure the normal vital activity of the members of socialist society. Our social system itself is the main political guarantee ensuring the rights and liberties of Soviet citizens. The implementation of the course worked out by the Party towards expanding elections and deepening democracy and the self-management principles will doubtlessly add to the political guarantees of citizens' rights. On the other hand, an important place here must also belong to legal guarantees, the importance of which was somewhat underestimated in the past. Many legislative provisions dealing with civil rights suffered from their declarative nature and were not buttressed by specific legal mechanisms. This drawback is now being put right, step by step.

While persistently promoting democracy in the country, the Soviet Union declares for international cooperation in the humanitarian field, which we consider a foundation of a comprehensive system of international security.

In the wake of this policy the USSR, as we all know, has proposed the convocation of a representative conference of the states participating in the European Conference on the entire package of humanitarian problems, including contacts between people, and questions of information, culture and education.

It is no accident that we link human rights to the state of international cooperation. To find a correct solution to this problem, there is a need for a new political mentality. The Soviet Union's foreign policy acts in the field of nuclear disarmament, the establishment of an all-embracing system of international security, and the military doctrine adopted at the latest conference of the Warsaw Treaty Organization's Political Consultative Committee are aimed in the final analysis at preserving general human values and, above all, at ensuring such a fundamental human right as the right to life.

The seven decades that have elapsed since October 1917 have confirmed that socialism and democracy are indivisible. Today we understand more deeply than ever before the meaning of Lenin's words that "victorious socialism is impossible unless it realizes the full scope of democracy". Following this behest, we have marched and are marching forward along the socialist path, giving broad vistas to the most powerful creative force of socialism - the free labour of free people in a free country.

WRITER: OPENNESS MUST APPLY TO HISTORY TOO

PM151549 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 4 Jul 87 p 6

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof Genrikh Volkov, member of the USSR Writers Union: "Are We To Be Mankurts?"; published in response to 21 March 1987 SOVETSKAYA KULTURA "conversation" with Professor Yu. Afanasyev entitled "From Positions of Truth and Realism"]

[Text] "Last year I graduated by correspondence course from the Institute of Culture in Tashkent. I worked for 4 years in a publishing house. After reading the interview with Yu. Afanasyev in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 21 March 1987, I began to think seriously. It was terrible: Because we know absolutely nothing. We know nothing about the present or about the real history of our state.

"The October Revolution... This concept is familiar to everybody. Soldiers, sailors, and workers threw open the gates and took the Winter Palace by storm. There were red flags... Lenin made a speech... But after all, that was still by no means everything. Who was at his side? Who led the uprising in practice? And the assault? And what happened next?

"Or again, I saw the film 'Repentance' and understood very little of it. Not because it was a bad film, but because I know very little about that historical period. The same is true of my contemporaries. It was all involved, embellished... If it had been like that in the past, if it was always like that, we would all behave like Mankurts!" (From a letter by Yelena Fomina, aged 27, to the editorial office).

No doubt everybody can remember the terrible legend of the Mankurts from the novel by Chingiz Aytmatov "The Day Is Longer Than 100 Years." Some young people, taken into slavery, had their heads shaved and a band of fresh camel's hide stretched onto them. As the hide dried out, the band tightened. The people experienced terrible torments in the full glare of the sun and lost their memory. Forever. The Mankurt did not know who he was, or what familiy or tribe he was from. [paragraph continues]

He was still the same Ivan, but he could not remember his family.... Instead he was now a diligent and submissive executor.

This legend is highly symbolic. What makes us people is our historical memory. It is our association with the spiritual heritage of the past. It is our recognition of ourselves as heirs to and continuers of the acts of countless past generations, being part of them, and having an inner kinship with them.

A wise man said: One person does not make a human being. Two people do not make a human being. A human being is the whole of humanity. I would add: A human being is not just all of mankind living now, but all the previous generations too.

Apart from the genetic inheritance, a human being is formed by his social inheritance. We are not simply the biological heirs of our ancestors, the repositories of their genetic program. We inherit their material and spiritual culture and the social field of civilization, which we extend as our own potential and talents permit and pass on to the next generations.

The achievements of past generations -- their struggle of ideas, their discoveries, accomplishments, and thoughts and the thorns and the tragedies on the road toward these feats -- all this does not die. All this continues to live in the succeeding generations. Sparks of human thought and historical memory are constantly flying to us from the ashes of the past to sustain and fan the living fire of our spiritual life today. And if that fire starts to fade and die in our eyes, is it not the case that the sparks from the past have stopped flying to us? Is it not the case that we have stopped listening to the hum of history? Or that we do not want to or are afraid to listen to it?

A human being is all of mankind, present, past, and future. And this is by no means a figurative expression. A human being only feels himself to be a full-blooded spiritual being when he is shaped by the whole social field and the whole wealth of his generation. We are rich in the wealth of the spirit of past generations. We are rich in our history. And if just one brick is removed from its foundation, the whole edifice is distorted. Each of us will be the poorer.

Quite frequently you hear reproaches from scholars: "It is no good going back into history to deal with the present day." And now two prominent historians are calling for all social scientists, as part of restructuring, to abandon their studies and rush to the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and industrial enterprises.

It seems that our history is not topical. But what do we find in the present day without elucidating the past historical experience of our country in all its fullness? What will we understand of how and why we must restructure and of how we can avoid errors and miscalculations? In order to know the society in which we live today, we must know the one in which we lived yesterday! This is all the more necessary in order to build the society in which we will live tomorrow.

Is it really necessary for historians to prove that history is the most topical thing in the world? This was understood very well by the poet-historian Pushkin: "Savagery, baseness, and ignorance do not respect the past as they grovel before the present alone."

Recently an article of literary criticism put it well -- history is not behind us, as we are accustomed to think, but in front of us. And this is no paradox. [paragraph continues]

Let us recall Pushkin again. In his dispute with P.Ya. Chaadayev, he based his firm confidence in Russia's future "lofty destiny" exclusively on its history.

History is in front of us.

If it suits us to stand still and cheerfully mark time, we can treat history as we please and even use it to create the illusion of energetic progress (as compared with 1913!). But we will not take a single successful step forward without basing ourselves on real -- not smoothed-over and adapted -- history.

In currently organizing the economic mechanism of acceleration on the basis of self-regulation with the help of commodity-money relations, we turn to Lenin's cooperative plan, to his "New Economic Policy" (NEP), and try to understand why the NEP -- which Lenin described as "serious and long-lasting" -- was rapidly curtailed after his death. And how much we were set back by the "great leap forward" of universal, "wholesale" collectivization and disregard of Lenin's instruction that rash transformations in the countryside were dangerous: "As long as there is no material base in our countryside for communism, as long as that is so, it would be, one could say, harmful, it would be, one should say, fatal for communism." And what did his comrades-in-arms think of that?

Yu. Afanasyev is right: Even now party history is being expounded according to the "Short Course" program, whose author alone appears in a halo of infallibility, while his opponents are daubed in black tar. It is no secret to anybody today that the "Short Course" is a distorting mirror to history in which some figures appear disproportionately enlarged, and others ludicrously diminished. Dwarves and giants. Strictly speaking, there is only one giant there. The rest are pygmies, deviationists, and enemies of the people.

"Should history be revised?" -- the article's authors inquire angrily. How can it be revised further? Our country's history has been so distorted in many works and has so many gaping blank spots and shades of black tar that there is nowhere for it to be distorted further. History should not be revised, but the distorting mirror which reflects it should be corrected.

Recently I involuntarily overheard a conversation between two humanities students.

"Do you know who Beriya was?"

"I heard that he spoke out against Khrushchev and was 'retired.'"

"I am interested in knowing," V.I. Kovalev from Rostov-na-Donu writes to the editorial office, "what happened in our country between the spring of 1953 and the 20th party congress. The textbooks describe this period with as much detail as the saying: 'The grass kept on growing....' So who are the rogues who have done the same to the history of Soviet power as Lysenko did to genetics?"

It is time that the principles of openness were extended to the entire history of the party too. There should be no blank spots and no banned topics or banned names in it. So that we can compare the positions and arguments of various sides in political disputes in all their fullness.

On reading a description of the events on the eve of October and subsequent events, you discover with surprise that virtually all Lenin's comrades-in-arms -- excluding two or three -- proved subsequently to be renegades, traitors, deviationists, enemies of the people, and so forth. Was Lenin really so shortsighted politically? "Did Lenin really not understand the party cadres as well as the authors of so many historical party works seasoned with the spirit of unforgettable sectarianism?" lecturer (E. Savtsov Sverdlovsk) writes to the editorial office. "And they, slandered and defamed, do not expect favors from historians, but just one thing -- historical justice."

Now, on the evening of the 70th anniversary of October, it would be appropriate to publish the memories of that great event by its active participants. Be assured that the communist conviction of our readers -- the most educated in the world -- will not suffer by that. On the contrary, they will only gain a really deep conviction when it becomes possible to independently compare different opinions.

The distorted and adapted depiction of history gives rise to a distorted and adapted awareness, which is a dogmatic awareness, in which the "truth" features in the role once and for all of set, stereotyped cliches and iron formulas.

I recall how in the past at Moscow State University exams, the lecturer in party history would ask:

"How does our party stand?"

The student would reply, stammering with emotion, that the party stands unshakable, firm, and confident...

"Not that, not that," the lecturer would say wryly. "Do you not know the 'Short Course.' Our party stands 'like a rock.'"

If the party is a "unique order of sword bearer within the Soviet state" ("I. Stalin, "Vol 5, p 71), then of course it must be armed with a code of sacred dogmas which it only remains to take on trust and learn by rote. It is unnecessary, even criminal, harmful, and heretical here to try to understand, ponder, doubt, or seek the truth. But if the party is the mind, honor, and conscience of our age, then it is dishonest and unscrupulous to distort history in favor of any particular external considerations (which are passed off as higher considerations), which bear no relation to the truth.

Marx formulated his moral and ethical position in social science by the following categorical method: "But the person who strives to /ADAPT/ science to a viewpoint which is drawn not from science itself (however science has erred) but /FROM OUTSIDE/, to a viewpoint which is dictated by interests that are alien and /ETERNAL/ to science -- I call such a person 'base.'" [capitalized words between slantlines published in boldface]

The new generations just embarking on life are caused tremendous and irreparable damage by what Marxist-Leninist teaching presents precisely as a code of prepared truths and the solution to all enigmas, and it only remains for the "foolish, uninitiated world" to "open its mouth to taste the roast grouse of absolute science."

Thus we are seeing disillusioned people who believe that Marxism is outdated and that the truth can only be found in the newfangled "isms" appearing in the West and filtering through to us. They do not even assume that the concept of Marxism which they received in their student days is totally at odds with genuine Marxism.

Marxism is primarily a method of seeking the truth, a theoretical weapon in the struggle to attain it. It is a constantly developing doctrine, revealing all the contradictions of the contemporary world, and an open doctrine absorbing the scientific and cultural achievements of mankind.

Marxism is a fighting doctrine. It was formulated and developed in passionate polemics, in the clash of different viewpoints, in the bitter struggle against bourgeois and petit-bourgeois ideology. And this struggle was conducted by Marx, Engels, and Lenin fully armed with indestructible logic; it was conducted cogently, cheerfully, and with talent. And it is very important to grasp this vital, fire-breathing, fighting essence of Marxism.

Their adversaries and opponents were major figures too. And to belittle them and depict them as caricatures means reducing the struggle itself to the level of a petty squabble. Weitling, Proudhon, and then Lassalle and Bakunin were extraordinarily gifted, brilliant, talented, and very popular personalities. Marx and Engels had a complex attitude toward them: They valued them highly but also criticized them mercilessly.

The legendary Bakunin, insanely bold, leader of the risings of 1848-1849 and 1871 and prisoner of the tsarist cells, who carried out a daring escape from Siberian exile, was the theoretician of anarchy and leader of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy. He was the most bitter enemy of Marx and Engels and the idol of the Russian People's Freedom Party members. Lenin conducted an inner dialogue with him when he was pondering the fate of the state under socialism. With him? He waged a constant political struggle against Bakunin's adherents in the early years of Soviet power. And Lenin included his name in the list of immortals on the obelisk by the Kremlin wall.

The Marxist-Leninist teachings about the state, about the dictatorship of the proletariat, about proletarian democracy and self-management were all engendered in polemics with Bakunin. And it is only possible to grasp these teachings in all their profundity by knowing Bakunin's works. And they have not been published since the twenties. They have been taboo for 60 years now. What are we afraid of? That Bakunin's arguments are more convincing than the arguments of Marx, Engels, and Lenin? Ridiculous! But a Marxist who does not know Bakunin's works is just as spiritually limited as one who does not know, for instance, the works of Herzen, Chernyshevskiy, Lavrov, Tkachev, Kropotkin, or Mikhaylovskiy...

From teaching experience I know that it is difficult to assimilate Lenin's "Materialism and Empiriocriticism' if it is taught just on its own. But how can matters be changed when the living figures of his opponents rise behind Lenin's text -- Bogdanov, Lunacharskiy, Gorkiy, Valentinov... And these are by no means unremarkable figures. How could they be mistaken? How could a most important, original thinker such as the Bolshevik Bogdanov be deceived by Machism? Today he is rightly regarded as the founder of the theory of social management. And his works too are awaiting republication and a new readership.

It is shameful to say, but we know German philosophy much better than Russian philosophy. All the German classics have been published and republished in our country. And that is wonderful. But our historians of philosophy seem to have written more about the most impoverished German philosophers -- about some Christian Wolff or Hermann Weimarus -- than about our most major thinker-idealists: Chaadayev, V. Solovyev, Fedorov, Berdyayev, Sorokin... No, they are "reactionary philosophers," and that is that.

During the period of the postulation of historical truths, as is known, the whole trend in philosophical science -- engaged in the elaboration of dialectical logic -- was branded as Menshevik idealism. [paragraph continues]

Its defeat was inflicted by people who did not even have scientific degrees, but who had made breathtaking scientific careers for themselves: Mitin and Yudin were made academicians for their zeal in organizing pogroms. Since then, following their example, the task of philosophy has been reduced to merely extolling the widsom of their inspirer and commenting on his works.

After the 20th congress philosophical life revived perceptibly. I believe that one of the outstanding achievements of that period was the elaboration of the Marxist method embodied in "Das Kapital" -- the method of ascending from the abstract to the concrete. This elaboration was carried out chiefly in the works of M. Rozental and especially E. Ilyenkov. Lenin's behest in the sphere of philosophy was fulfilled thereby to a certain degree.

Several brilliant individual works have appeared on the problems of philosophy and scientific communism. They did not lie for long on the bookstore shelves. The brilliant works of A.F. Losev on ancient aesthetics were a major scientific event, and specific sociological research was revived. But the great hopes which were pinned on this were not justified in all respects. Ultimately this research died out too.

The period of stagnation had a serious effect on philosophical thought too.

According to Hegel, the owl Minerva -- symbol of philosophical wisdom -- flies into the twilight when day is done and impassively writes "gray on gray." In the same way our philosophical thought, impassively and unthinkingly "gray on gray," would comment according to tradition on speeches and reports. People may raise objections to me, pointing to the "cornerstones" of multivolume collected works. But since when has "gross output" in science been an indicator of its success?

Recently a quite well-known scholar exclaimed enthusiastically at a symposium that we need "philosophical acceleration." I imagined with horror tons and tons of featureless collected folios pouring off the production line at an ever increasing pace: Monographs which few people read but which gratify the self-esteem and ambitions of the authors and compilers.

And other historians too angrily refute reproaches about stagnation in historical science by referring to multivolume publications, quantity, and bulk. There is no denying that much labor has been expended. But, after all, it is not a question of how much has been published. It is a question of how far historical thought has advanced and how much it has rid itself of former models and dogmas. F. Vaganov and A. Ponomarev write: "The appearance of fundamental multivolume works was of major social significance and marked a qualitatively new stage in the development of historical science." This is, of course, one stance; and, given such a stance, no restructuring is needed in historical science. It only remains for historians to go out to the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and enterprises...

This is not the opinion of many readers who have sent in their views on the publication "From Positions of Truth and Realism." They cite instances of the continuing falsification of our country's history in the latest multivolume publications.

"It is necessary to analyze the actual course of events, not simply and, perhaps, not even so much for the sake of restoring the honored names of the past," lecturer E. Savtsov writes, "But primarily for the sake of the present day." [paragraph continues]

"It is above all a question of how we -- the people of today -- set about restructuring today. It is impossible to count seriously on managing to combine for very long the most advance ideas of today and the primitive theoretical baggage of the 'Short Course.' Which side we come down on -- forward or backward -- depends on whether we finally investigate the sources and true sense of the events of 1929, 1937-1938, and 1948-1949."

Let us recall M.S. Gorbachev' recent words: "What? Do we not have it in us today, do we not have enough scientific and literary resources to write the history of the motherland and the party? This should be an honest, courageous, and fascinating book, revealing the heroic path traveled by the country and the party in all its greatness -- the path of pioneers. It should be a book that does not pass over the dramatic nature of events and human destinies, in which there should be no blank pages, subjective preferences, and antipathies, and whose value should not depend on fashions of the moment."

And I would like to end this article with some lines from Yelena Fomina's letter with which I began. "I am ashamed that I have been dozing for so long. The article 'From Positions of Truth and Realism' and the film 'Repentance' roused me -- that is enough sleeping. So we need such films. We need such articles. Discussions about restructuring weary listeners and readers; it is not talk but action that is necessary. That is enough of sensations, enough of meetings and conferences: Let us just get down to work. Each person -- honestly and in his rightful place. And study -- we all need to study a lot! So, comrade scholars, help us! After all, it is not somebody abstract, but we ourselves who are building the new society. And how we do this depends primarily on our senior comrades. So be frank and honest with us. We want the truth."

And that is the answer of the new generation embarking on life to the rhetorical question which is the title of this article.

MOSCOW SEMINAR HITS 'DOGMATIZING' OF HISTORY

PM1211451 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 29 19 Jul 87 p 10

[Natalya Davydova article: "Progress Is Possible Only When We Learn From History" -- first two paragraphs are unattributed introduction]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education has launched a competition for a new textbook on the history of the CPSU. The competition rules were published in the No 5 issue of the VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS (QUESTIONS OF CPSU HISTORY) magazine. The Moscow City Party Committee held a seminar not long ago for the teachers of CPSU history at Moscow institutes and universities to discuss what the textbook should be like. The report was made by Nikolay Maslov, D.Sc. (History), head of the CPSU History Department at the Academy of Social Sciences attached to the CPSU Central Committee.

Here we offer MN readers a synopsis of the report's main ideas.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke emotionally and vividly at the 20th Komsomol Congress on what the future textbook should be like. He said: "This must be an honest, courageous and fascinating book, throwing light on the great and heroic road traversed by the country and Party, the road of trailblazers. This book must not be shy of the drama of certain events and some individuals' destinies. It must be free from blank pages, subjectivist pros and cons, and opportunism."

And the announcement of the competition on the future textbooks tells us that it must be compiled "with account taken of the operating higher school curricula", be on a high scientific and methodological level, and of not a large volume (up to 30 printer's sheets), and "foster in the students and interest in the heroic history of our Communist party".

So, what should it be like then?

We do have experience in compiling textbooks on party histroy, both favourable and unfavourable. The first study aids on the history of the Bolshevik Party, by N. Baturin and M. Lyalov, were published in 1906. Works by Bubnov, Nevskiy Yavoslavskiy, Popov and others appeared after the October Revolution. They were used as aids for studying Bolshevism's history for about 15 years. The Short Course of the CPSU(B) [as published] History was published. It was canonized and its contents were declared to be the only interpretation of questions of Party history. The textbook expounded our Party's history from the point of view of the personality cult. It did play a certain role in the spreading of knowledge on Party history both at home and abroad, but, at the same time, was a source of dogmatism and of ideas that Party history was a sort catechism which should be learned by heart and not be deviated from even an iota.

What harm does dogmatizing history bring about? People lose the ability to think on their own about it and get used to blindly accepting and reiterating any idea.

A whole series of textbooks appeared after the 20th Party Congress where the Short Course had been subjected to biting criticism. However, their publication ceased later on, at the end of the 60s. Again only one textbook was left -- edited by B. Ponomarev. Its first edition came out in 1959. Initially it conformed to the time's demands, but started losing this quality from one edition to another, and avoided acute issues. What for example, is the difference between the 6th, 7th and 8th editions of this textbook? There is practically none. A new chapter was added each time, devoted to the latest Congress, and the preceding chapters were cut out.

Social sciences in their present state have a lot of shortcomings. We are aware of them -- dogmatism, scholasticism, divorcement from life, tendentiousness, one-sideness in the assessment of many periods in history and making it anonymous. In order to compile a new textbook on Party history, it is needed, above all, to decide what we should discard or what to take from it.

The dogmas which used to impede the Party historians' scientific thought are still being overcome with difficulty today.

First of all it is the dogma on the non-conflicting development of the Party. For many years its history was related as a processsion of victories, successes and achievements. We have built socialism, created a new society and new human relations - those are our historical gains. But already Chernyshevskiy had noted that political activity was not the sidewalk of Nevskiy Avenue. Quite a few both objective and subjective problems had blocked our path. The non-conflict theory is not just an embellisment of life but is is a distortion of the truth.

The second dogma is the idea that any historical personality who had made any sort of a political error was a primordial opponent of Leninism and socialism. This point of view has been far from rooted out to this day. It creates a distorted concept of Party cadres, its leaders, of the people who surrounded Lenin, and of the history of the Revolution and socialist construction. [paragraph continues]

We should speak about mistakes made by Party functionaries, but, at the same time should not forget their merits.

Lenin said: "The history of ideas is that of the succession and consequently of the conflict of ideas." Therefore we must regard inner Party struggle as a struggle of ideas. Not everyone is aware that the civic rehabilitation of Smilga was held recently. The charges that he was a state criminal were lifted from him. Many Party functionaries well merit a civic rehabilitation since they had not been spies, assassins or agents of foreign intelligence services, but all of them had been convicted on precisely such charges.

The third dogma was in the assurance that the leading role of the Party was growing steadily, nearly automatically, all the time. This growth was viewed as a constant upward movement without any obstacles or depressions. But how could we say that when the country was in a state of stagnation and "precrisis phenomena" were much in evidence, as Mikhail Gorbachev said in his interview to the L'UNITA newspaper? The presence of objective factors is only a precondition for the growth of the Party's role, whereas growth itself depends on the subjective factor -- the nature of the Party's activities, beginning with the primary up to the central organizations. But can we speak of this when the Party and government leadership, as it was said at the January Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, had committed the gravest mistakes, when a part of the leading cadres in Moscow itself, to say nothing of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia and Rostov-on-Don, had degenerated and many primary Party organizations also failed to take a stand of principle?

And the last dogma which is impeding an objective study of Party history is that all the Party documents are one hundred per cent true -- the truth in the last instance. Whereas some of them, as it is recognized nowadays, did not always correspond to the truth.

The principle of democratic centralism (when it is possible to discuss a document only until the decision is taken, after which each Party member is duty-bound to fulfil it) was spread also to Party documents, which had been adopted 20, 30 and 50 years ago. Instead of providing a historical assessment, for example, for the November 14, 1938 Resolution of the Party Central Committee "On the tasks of the Party propaganda in connection with the publication of the Short Course of the CPSU(B) History", which became one of the reasons of dogmatism in social sciences in general, and in Party history studies in particular, it is being simply excluded, as an awkward document, from the latest editions.

Another fact that arouses a feeling of protest is that images of living people are nearly non-existent in our historical works and, the more so, in our textbooks. The Party's outstanding personalities should be described, even if only briefly.

As for Party leaders -- if we are to believe the textbooks -- we've had none at all since Lenin. Stalin and Khrushchev are mentioned at best as speakers at Party Congresses. And they were complex and controversial personalities who had been at the head of the Party and the state for many decades. We can and must give them an objective scientific testimonial. We publish books on Roosevelt, Churchill and Eden, but we haven't yet written a political biography of Stalin. Hundreds of them have been written in the world and all of them -- from anti-Soviet and anti-communist positions. The same can be said also about many others of our leaders.

We need collections of materials on Party history. Here is a very interesting example of such a study aid. It is the Reader on Leninism by Karpov and Fridner, which had been published in 1925. It carried not only reprints of Lenin's works and Party documents, but also articles and speeches by opponents of Leninism. One could get an idea of the stands taken by the opposing sides not from chance quotes from the context, and specially processed, too, but from real documents. It contained articles by Martov, Trotskiy, Bukharin, Shlyapnikov and others, which were published in the course of general Party discussions. Students can and must have an opportunity to reveal the correctness of Leninism for themselves, on their own. "Our strength lies in stating the truth," Lenin said.

And, lastly, about the textbooks' theoretical standards. Why should they list all the Congresses, conferences, agendas and statistics on the delegates? All that can be found in reference books. The textbook should expound the strategic lines in Party activities, which would make it possible to regard the Party history on a major scale, through the main problems it had encountered, so as to be able, above all, to grasp its giant historical experience and the lessons stemming through. Lenin said in his time: We must "transfer the centre of gravity more the lessons we are receiving and which we must receive for our immediate practical activity, rather than to a description of what we have passed through". This is the road which we must follow so as to embody the more than 100 years of our Party's history in 30 printer's sheets. Hegel once said that nations and governments have never learned anything from history. Bernard Shaw also subscribed to the idea. But historian Klyuckevskiy didn't agree with them. He said: "History teaches even those who do not learn from it, it gives it to them properly for their ignorance and negligence." It is impossible to make a single step forward today without absorbing the experience of the past.

IMPACT OF SOVETSKAYA KULTURA COLUMN VIEWED

PM191841 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 3

[V. Malukhin article under the rubric "Books: New This Week": "Word That Is Action"]

[Text] "Direct Speech" is a rubric in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA and the title of a book which features 35 monologues on current affairs themes published under this rubric. Their authors are prominent figures in the sphere of literature and the arts, philosophers, sociologists, and historians, a whole pleiad of names which are on everyone's lips.

The "direct speech" which first rang out from the newspaper rubric shortly after the 27th CPSU Congress means much more to us all today than a mere grammatical category. Since then, similar "free platforms" in the Soviet periodical press have become yet another constant and necessary feature of the country's social life. Let us recall how restructuring began. In the beginning there was the word, and the word was: "Speak up!" Direct speech by its very nature implies a candor which may not always please, and it invariably means personal responsibility for what has been said. The need for both was building up in our country for a long time. The spring was released when the time of open words came.

All kinds of "deliberations" abounded in print in the past, too; however, they were frequently the product of devious minds and pens and smacked strongly of ritualistic incantations. Many hands were carefully draping the ugly forms of the statue of silence with demagogic rhetoric. It was a painful spectacle for those in whom incorruptible talent, sound morality, and intellectual integrity had survived. [paragraph continues]

It would be incorrect to believe that truth is today returning from the twilight sphere to the arena of a social life broken and profaned. It has never left those who lived and acted according to its law, who defended its merit, and helped it as much as they could through the difficult times. This must be remembered especially today when appeals for truth are ringing out and when truth has been furnished with a bundle of documents which testify to its changed position. They include a letter of safe conduct, a residence permit, and a pass entitling it to cross blind walls...

The word that is action. This old formula contains in coded, "compressed" form quiet a few options for development. Currently openness is playing a dual role. First, it contains the motive energy which has to be released during the radical restructuring of socioeconomic relations. Second, it provides the only guarantee of the irreversibility of the processes of renewal. In this situation openness must pursue a single aim, that of the further expansion and deepening and steady growth of its specific weight in our social life. If a hitch occurred in the mechanism of restructuring, its first symptom would be a narrowing of the scope of openness. It is like a door which can either be opened or closed; there is no other option.

The anthology under the title "Direct Speech" is a full-scale account by the newspaper of the initial stage of restructuring in social consciousness and at the same time is an indication of the level of real openness. Judging by the fact that the first step was not easy, it is possible to assume that the next will be even more difficult. So far, only the top layer of problems has been removed. Civic anguish about the fate of the fatherland has poured forth into words addressed to the "people at large:" many things have been called by their proper names; the first line of defenses around zones which were closed to criticism has been brought down; acute issues which were becoming painfully obvious have been brought into the open. But what lies ahead is immeasurably more difficult -- working through from the surface to the underlying causes of phenomena, exposing their hidden root system without which the "hot" rubric risks a gradual cooling.

Here is a reader's letter:

"Openness is all very well. But why do we need a special rubric for it; should not the whole newspaper and indeed our whole press be a 'Direct Speech' rubric? This question is not just addressed to newsmen but to us all. And the answer will have to take the shape of action, of day-to-day work, of overcoming the resistance of the materials and of our own social reflexes which have taken shape over the years. We are only now beginning to grasp the fact in all its dramatic impact that many people found it easier to gradually lose their humanity than to drive out the slave in them now.

Today the free circulation of mutually exclusive views, the clash of dissimilar viewpoints, and the possibility of alternative solutions mean that public opinion in the original sense of the word is being born in the country. And speaking out directly, without dodging, is and will remain the best way of shaping public opinion while taking into account the interests of the most varied strata and groups. The very first article under the "Direct Speech" rubric contained the following passage: "I take a different view, of course, of certain historical facts... But we both have a right to express our different views because they are based on our shared love for the motherland, and I must defend your right, and you must defend my right..."

The times of direct speech continue. I open SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. And I look for the familiar rubric.

F. BURLATSKIY HITS OPPONENTS OF RESTRUCTURING

PM191605 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 87 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Fedor Burlatskiy: "Notes of a Current Affairs Journalist; Learning Democracy"]

[Text] The country has begun to move and act. Openness and democracy have given each individual the opportunity to speak out about every painful issue. In terms of the pitch at which life is being lived, the last 2 years have been more action-packed than certain entire decades because so many problems have been raised at political forums, at labor collectives, in the press, in literature, in the theater, and on television. Public opinion is becoming an increasingly important factor in acceleration.

But even in ancient times it was known that the Word must be followed by the Deed. Otherwise the word is merely a source of irritation to the soul. Need it be said that unconstructive criticism is merely the level at which social awareness begins. Everyone rights rejects the complacent daydreaming of Gogol's character Manilov -- a practice which for so long had fed the people with a succession of promises of a land flowing with milk and honey. But no less harmful were the impudent escapades -- typical of Gogol's Nozdrev -- which were as vacuous as soap bubbles. What is needed most of all is businesslike work to accelerate the country's development and to heal our economic and social ills.

As M.S. Gorbachev said at a meeting with leaders of the mass media and of the creative unions, we are once again, as it were, passing through a school of democracy. Everyone, leaders and the masses alike, is learning to work under new conditions, cultivating in social awareness the seeds of a genuine political culture which serves restructuring.

Our political culture has a quite long and, let us be blunt, a quite contradictory tradition. And, as Pushkin said, tradition is the soul of a state [derzhava].

In our past there was Kievan Rus and the Novgorod Veche which few people remember; there were 300 years of Eastern enslavement, then Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great; there was the gloomy Nicholas I, and the pathetic Nicholas II.... Pushkin's phrase "the people remain silent" reflected the political tradition of authoritarianism. And not long before that, Jean-Jacques Rousseau had passed the terrifying judgment: In Russia there will never be democracy because it is a country of slaves; the people have the government they deserve. Chaadayev, that unfortunate Russian genius, threw out to those who came after him a cry wrenched from his sick consciousness: Russia -- a land without a future.

Fortunately he was mistaken, just as the thinker from Geneva [Rousseau] was mistaken. In October 1917 the people who for centuries had been oppressed but never crushed, made, under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, a mighty dash for democracy. We are not slaves, we are indeed not slaves! But the path to power for the people was strewn with thorns and soaked with blood.

In Lenin's time the worker, sailor, soldier, and peasant began to learn how to run the state. But the paucity of general and political culture was by no means the only factor which led to the situation where management for the working people came about instead of management through the working people.

The tendency toward the bureaucratization of management against which Lenin waged a resolute struggle intensified after his death. History has yet to have its say on that epoch. [paragraph continues]

It has yet to have its say about what was created for the first time on our soil (of which we will always be proud) by the selfless, ecstatic struggle of the party and of the whole people for technical and social progress. And about how our great and courageous people managed in the Patriotic War to hold out and gain victory at such a dreadful cost. And also about what we cannot and do not have the right to excuse or try to justify -- the cruel repressions against the cadres in the party, in the Army, and among the intelligentsia, about human tragedies.

Let me observe, incidentally, that the personality cult itself was not just implanted from above. Alas, it reflected a phenomenon of a particular level of the masses' political culture.

In the period which began after the 20th CPSU Congress, light and dark also used to be quaintly intermingled. Guarantees were created against the restoration of the personality cult and repressions. However, at that time a radical transformation of our society was not successfully carried out. In the seventies, negative processes, unsolved problems, and the phenomena of stagnation and conservatism were accumulating.

Then came April 1985. How much, indeed, we have experienced in so short a time! Openness, democratization, economic reforms -- all this has stirred the soul of every individual.

Before our very eyes a new Soviet political culture has begun to take shape to a considerable degree. And together with this a political person has also begun to take shape -- an active participant in the social process. A person with his own opinion, stances, and his own preferences and actions. And something which could have been presupposed in advance has been revealed. We do not have views which fully coincide, although we all stand on the ground of socialism, Soviet power, and the party's leadership of the country.

So where does the opposition to restructuring come from? Many are convinced that only the bureaucracy is resisting.

But this is by no means the monopoly of representatives of the management apparatus. A section of the masses, a section which is passive toward change, must also be regarded as a factor for retarding restructuring although, with a minor exception, people are taking a very responsible attitude toward what is taking place.

Let us begin with the bureaucrat, because for the time being he has far greater influence and more depends on him. The fact is, each executant, even in the most modest official position, is faced with the problem of making a choice. What should he serve by his personal work: Bold structural changes in the conditions of labor and in the provision of incentives for such work, and the promotion of the development of people's initiative, or should it be cautious little steps and minor organizational and cadre changes?

It would seem to be obvious that most ineffectual of all would be micro-reforms -- a kind of dinosaur, so to speak, a monster, half horse and half bird, which can neither gallop nor fly. But the former over-cautious individual as before still bides his time and even tries on the sly, casting glances over his shoulder, to put the brakes on a party decision prescribed to him -- on the introduction of the team contract, on the development of the cooperative movement, on the family contract, on individual labor, and on the effective struggle against corruption and unearned income.

After all, a decision does not directly establish a norm of law, that is, the obligation to carry out some particular action under threat of sanction -- be it financial, administrative, or even criminal sanction. [paragraph continues]

For some time old laws and a multitude of instructions have continued to operate which to this day can be used as a refuge by those "cautious" local representatives of authority and management.

The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum took into account the whole significance of the juridical form of social relations and the humanitarian and ethical impact of socialist law. The plenum discussed a whole package of documents which were adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. A firm legal foundation is thereby being laid beneath the edifice of economic reforms which is being erected. Let us hpe that juridical backup for all decision will become an obligatory means of their implementation.

Apart from the "old bureaucrat" and cautious advocate of "playing safe," the resourceful phrase-monger of restructuring, who flourished in the past and who is very eager to consolidate his position in the new period, is once again trying to emerge on the surface. However, what is needed now is not cleverness, not the sharp-witted ability to jump on the restructuring bandwagon, but devotion to the cause, professionalism, and indeed, straightforward decency and sincerity.

And so we come to yet another kind of impersonator. A person has been elected to a post -- at a plant, in a scientific establishment, in a creative organization. In which direction does he channel his activity: toward the common cause or serving himself first and foremost? As soon as a new leader gets caught up, so to speak, in an activity which was customary in the past -- acquiring titles, bonuses, awards, and official positions, and taking trips to Europe -- it is clear that what we have is a "self-seeking restructurer."

Alongside the fervent advocates of restructuring who have brought it into being literally through the sufferings of their own experience, people are turning up who kept mum in the past but who are now in a hurry to make up for lost time and who do not hesitate to voice the most extreme opinions. Of course, any opinion which is dictated by a desire to serve the cause of renewal merits attention. But the right to criticism also presupposes the right to criticize the criticism, as Marx said.

For instance, we hear facile opinions about the need for, and even usefulness of, unemployment as a lever for promoting the growth of labor productivity.

Need one recall that guaranteed work and social security constitute the chief gains of the socialist system. And no one in our country will agree to renounce these gains which were achieved at a high price. But let us look at this question from a practical viewpoint.

We have repeatedly heard from the leaders of many enterprises that they are ready to reduce the number of workers by one-fourth or even by one-third on condition that the remaining wages fund the remuneration of workers who are left. On a nationwide scale, one-fourth means several tens of millions of people. What would one do with them?

The state is not in a position to pension them all off. It is not possible even to think of throwing them out onto the street. This means that other ways must be found -- the redeployment and retraining of the work force. This means that it is necessary to give serious thought to what sort of body on a nationwide scale will occupy itself with this problem which will become increasingly acute as new techniques and technology are assimilated, and as the intensification of labor proceeds. And would it be fair to make the working people shoulder the burden of the transition period to the new system of management of the economy?

The dilemma being advanced -- a "free market" or a planned economy -- does not look all that naive. Of course there is currently the task of developing goods-money relationships. But bringing up that dilemma can only lead to another round of fruitless discussions instead of a search for ways to implement structural reforms.

One knows how acute are the problems here of overcoming excessive centralism and departmentalism. Having 18 million persons in the management apparatus is too great a price to pay for the hypertrophy of the principle of centralism. Obviously in conditions of the reform, when the enterprise and the association are becoming the chief component in planning and management, the central apparatus of the ministries and departments can be reduced by a factor of two, or even three, to the benefit of the cause. But need one return to the idea of sovnarkhozes [regional economic councils] that is, to return to a venture which failed in the sixties?

Experience is now being accumulated with elections held in accordance with the the multi-seat system in the soviets and in labor collectives. During the first experiments real problems came to light in the matter of improving the procedure of nominating candidates, conducting election campaigns, and developing the political culture of the masses. It is self-management which must ensure that not everyone is nominated for leadership posts but rather the most capable, talented organizers and genuine "doers."

The "grassroots" are also not free of the influence of social conditions. Restructuring is being opposed too by those who up to now have preferred to take more and work less, and who enrich themselves at the expense of this "deficit."

The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum convincingly showed that solutions must be sought by relying on contemporary experience and taking a long look into the future. Only profound revolutionary reforms can create a highly effective economic system which absorbs scientific and technical progress like a sponge and which is capable of sustaining competition with the leading industrial powers of the modern world.

There is also another kind of impersonator. Among the mass of people who are honestly and conscientiously making use of their new rights, including the right to elect leaders, there are also appearing those who are making use of openness in order to compromise exacting and principled leaders and more gifted specialists, to settle scores, and to grab those places which, in terms of their level of professional training, they do not deserve.

I recall a person who, during one particular meeting demanded unlimited "freedom to demonstrate." He was a typical ochlocrat (according to Aristotle, ochlocracy is rule by the mob). Such people have a fanatical belief in just one idea and are incapable even of hearing out an opponent. They burst out onto the streets in order to make a frequently unfounded protest and to rout those who disagree.

Who among us favors the unlimited "right to demonstrate?" Local nationalists, extremists from "Pamyat" [historical-patriotic association] and from other kindred groups, people pursuing selfish interests, so called "refuseniks" who want to emigrate, and so forth. Each of these groups opposes the other and if they are given a free rein you see if they do not start engaging in fisticuffs.

We have enough experience to realize that local nationalism and great power chauvinism, anti-Semitism and Zionism nurture each other and in so doing drink from the same vessel -- anarchy, disorder, and squalid, uncivilized political culture.

How rapidly the mutual penetration of democracy and ochlocracy takes place! Even yesterday, for example, representatives of "Pamyat" were insisting on the rightful idea of preserving Russian national culture -- monuments of days gone by, architecture, the names of cities, streets, and districts. In a word, they used to defend our national property and the widespread utilization of the values of the past. And that was a good thing. But people who operate from nationalistic and chauvinistic positions attached themselves to this movement.

Our society is the most educated in the world, but need one have to try to prove how much still has to be done in order to nurture the political culture and true civilization to which Lenin attached such tremendous significance? Much time will elapse before we all really master the art of conducting honest and conscientious polemics, hearing out one's opponent and even adversary, and overcoming in oneself the atavistic urge to "crush" or "liquidate" at any cost an opinion which does not coincide with our own opinion.

Democratization, the development of processes in the spiritual sphere, and the firm establishment of socialist and pan-human values is the main, and even sole way of carrying out restructuring. But it is precisely democracy that rejects lurching and tacking from one extreme to another which has cost our country so dearly.

It is now necessary to solve pressing problems step by step, passing from the elementary ones -- instilling order, overcoming corruption and the crudest forms of bureaucratism and uncivilized behavior -- to the more complex ones -- the introduction of cooperatives, the family contract, and individual labor in the structure of socialist production -- and then finally, to the most revolutionary problems -- the transformation of the system of the management of the national economy in accordance with the principles of the plan, full economic accountability [khozraschet], and the use of the achievements of the technical revolution. Now, the problem of the responsibility of each Soviet person for the destiny of restructuring, for the destiny of socialism, and for the destiny of the motherland has appeared more acutely than every before. It is toward this that the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum orients the party and country.

ARCHIVES HEAD ON WW II DOCUMENT DECLASSIFICATION

PM221355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with Lieutenant Colonel I. Venkov, acting chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Historical Archives Department, by V. Shcherban: "Archives Have Become More Accessible"; date and place not given; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Publication restrictions have been lifted from a large number of documents from the Great Patriotic War period. Our history has been supplemented with new facts which will undoubtedly be reflected in literature and art...

I met with Lt Col I. Venkov, acting chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Historical Archives Department.

"Our people's interest in the history of the war is great. However, the doors of many military archives for various reasons have often remained closed to those who wanted access. The military archives are treasure houses of information. They house Soviet Army and Navy materials for the period 1941 through 1980. There are around 30 million items in the archives. Access to them was either nonexistent or limited to a very narrow circle of people. Operational and combat documents and political materials have now been declassified. [paragraph continues]

And this has been done because there is now a greater need than ever to speak about the war truthfully and to describe combat operations openly..."

"Nevertheless, there are still documents which are secret."

"This applies to documents relating to mobilization which can be used to study and understand mobilizational work. That has been kept secret and will remain so. For example, the positioning of units can be learned from some of them. After all, the cities involved have not moved. Furthermore, I do not think that such information is of great interest to the public at large. I would go further and say that there are a number of documents dating back to World War I and the Civil War to which access is still restricted."

"What is the procedure for declassification of documents?"

"In some cases a directive is given that documents connected with specific combat operations must be made available. Materials from headquarters and the fronts are handled differently. There is a special commission of experts consisting of archivists and other specialists. All the arguments for and against are weighed up. If it is a question of declassifying a document concerning ground forces operations -- tankmen, say -- then representatives of that category of troops are invited along. But I would like archivists to be given greater rights on questions of declassifying documents which have been in archive storage for a long time."

"Is it correct that a time limit of 40 years is imposed on military documents after which the 'secret' classification is automatically removed?"

"Different countries treat this in different ways. Some countries do have a 50-year declassification rule. No such time limit has been imposed here."

"How long does declassification take?"

"It varies from several days to several months. It all depends, I repeat, on the character of the papers in question. Furthermore, each declassified document comes in for very close scrutiny abroad. Let me give you the following example. Our staffer wrote a book citing the Belorussian Front Military Council's appeal to the German population. Soon after, the FRG military attache sent a letter asking: 'What document are we to believe -- the one that appeared 40 years ago or this one?' It eventually became clear that our staffer had used one of the existing variations which omitted a paragraph."

"However, has a procedure governing access been imposed on many documents even though they are unclassified?"

"The fact is that there is a certain procedure for work in military archives: It is necessary to have right of access. After all, the archives are our spiritual legacy. For many more generations of people they will be a source of invaluable information on the past. We must present this rich legacy in the form in which it reached us. Here, by the way, are some statistics: In the past 5 years more than 3,000 researchers and writers have worked in the Ministry of Defense's central archives. They were seeking to produce military history and encyclopedic works, monographs, study manuals, military memoirs, and artistic works..."

"Where can the declassified works be seen?"

"As far as possible they will all go into broad scientific circulation. The most important materials of the Great Patriotic War period will go into a 5-volume anthology of documents of the USSR Armed Forces, on which military historians and archivists are now working. Incidentally, to ensure the prompt issue of permits for researchers to the central military archives, it is planned to shorten the time taken to examine and process applications. I would like the heads of social sciences department of military academies and higher educational institutions to step up work with archive documents. We are ready to give them all the necessary assistance."

NEARLY 1,000 REPORTEDLY SACKED FROM KAZAKH POLICE

AU211037 Paris AFP in English 1028 GMT 21 Jul 87

[Text] Moscow, July 21 (AFP) -- Authorities in the Soviet Central Asian republic of Kazakhstan have sacked almost 1,000 police officers in a mass purge following last year's anti-Russian riots, a report reaching Moscow on Tuesday said.

More than 16,000 officials in the republic's Interior and Justice Ministry were required to take "probationary tests" earlier this year, after which 15 per cent were either dismissed or demoted, the newspaper KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA said.

A total of 948 police officers, including 358 senior officials, were sacked for "covering up crimes, taking the law into their own hands, illegal arrests and excessive bureaucracy," the Communist Party newspaper said.

Twenty-four percent of the republic's judges were replaced in local elections in June, it added.

Police negligence had left "thousands of crimes" unpunished, PRAVDA said.

The newspaper also accused some of the police officers sacked of "slandering party and state leaders."

The riots were triggered when Moscow appointed an ethnic Russian as new Kazakhstan party chief to replace an ethnic Kazakh official.

BRIEFS

SVERDLOVSK AIRPORT UPGRADED -- A 350-seat Il-86 has landed at Sverdlovsk Koltsovo airport for the first time. The aircraft already flies to 12 other destinations in the USSR. The flight took about 2 hours. A new runway was built at Sverdlovsk and a modern navigational complex was installed in order to handle the aircraft. Following this test flight, regular routes will be flown to Moscow and Soviet resort towns, but more preparations are still needed. Many Soviet airports do not have the facilities to receive this aircraft. This year it is intended to use the Il-86 on the Leningrad-Alma-Ata and Moscow-Kemerovo routes. [Summary] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 18 Jul 87 LD]

ABALKIN DISCUSSES REFORM, SOCIALIST DIALECTICS

PM220921 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jul 87 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with L.I. Abalkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by Vladimir Denisov: "Dialectics of Socialism"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Denisov] Leonid Ivanovich, letters from readers supporting the course toward restructuring all spheres of our life nonetheless sometimes contain some doubt of what you might term a theoretical nature. They say that the classical science of socialism did not postulate the path which we have not chosen...

[Abalkin] The nature of these doubts is clear. We must distinguish those ideas about socialism and its economy which have become commonplace in the public consciousness from genuinely scientific views. Even among some scientific figures, especially among higher school teachers, the changes now taking place are seen as a departure from the principles of socialism, as the destruction of some of its age-old bastions. A critical reappraisal of many ideas which are essentially dogmas and prejudices is required. This is a tortured and anguished process. We are now reading through in a new way much of the traditional legacy of the classical science of socialism.

Well, the idea of self-administration for instance. It lies at the very foundation of views of socialism as the masses' living creation. This premise was substantiated by the founders of Marxism. But it has taken shape in such a way that their views have been moved aside and notions that self-administration is almost a revisionist concept have become widespread. In public awareness self-administration merged either with notions of some remote communist tomorrow when there would no longer be a state or with notions that self-administration and the state leadership of the economy are incompatible things. The present restructuring is breaking with these views. But it is not abandoning real classical views of socialism and its economic system.

The same may also be said of many other premises which we are introducing anew. They form the ideological foundation of the Law on the State Enterprise, for instance, the premises on the labor collective as the owner of the means of production assigned to it. It may seem unexpected, for after all in practice and in theory we have begun to present public property as being somehow faceless, anonymous, belonging to no one and protected by nothing. And a person saw himself not as the manager of this property but simply as the executor of the will of the state and its planning organs -- and no more. We are now moving toward making the collective not the formal owner, the merely legal owner, but the real owner and manager of the relevant means of production and financial resources and fully responsible for them. The more fully a person and the collective feel themselves to be the owners, the more socialism there will be.

Finally, let's take one more provision of the new law -- that the enterprise acts as a socialist commodity producer. For economic science in general and for political economy the question of commodity production under socialism, of its inherent commodity-money relations, and of the law of cost has long been clear. But unfortunately what has arisen is not only a gulf between word and deed but also a gulf between word and word, between what the most important conclusions and achievements of science actually were and the way in which we explained this and introduced it into people's consciousness. Of course, I would not say that everything was clear to science -- where everything is clear is the point at which science ends -- science which is always movement from ignorance to knowledge. [paragraph continues]

Without that there is no science but going round in circles, repeating truisms, or wandering in the dark. Science still has a lot to do. But, on the other hand, the preparation of the Law on the State Enterprise would have been impossible had the preformed theoretical groundwork, achieved through suffering, not stood behind it.

[Denisov] Questions are very often asked about the socialist nature of the transformations, in connection with the development of small-scale forms of the cooperative movement, the family contract, and individual labor.

[Abalkin] Here too we say boldly: What we are already doing produces more socialism! We must have a clear idea of whether the family contract is better or worse for people. Does it help to satisfy more fully their requirements, needs, and individual taste and to make rational use of reserves of physical and spiritual strength for resolving problems? If it benefits people, then it is working for socialism... Moreover, the cooperative movement is not a temporary form relating to the remote past. We now have a better understanding of many of Lenin's ideas including the idea that a system of civilized cooperative members is socialism, real socialism. It was in the cooperative movement that Lenin saw a complex means of combining personal, collective, and public interests... And, finally, about individual labor activity. If we rule out any forms of hired labor and exploitation then individual labor is a step forward, not backward... In general there is much that is speculative in discussions about "nonsocialistness." So people say that we are introducing individual labor activity. Yes, it is a reality, a fact that everyone knows about. People have been allowed to transport passengers in their own vehicles? After all they have been doing this for a long time and almost every one of us has taken advantage of these services without seeing anything reprehensible in it. The same may be said of other types of services. We are now merely moving to organized forms, including forms of state control, and we are putting individual labor on a planned footing and giving it a civilized appearance.

[Denisov] How far are the principles of Lenin's plan for building socialism being revealed in practice in the present restructuring and the present economic reform?

[Abalkin] In the classic understanding Lenin's plan for building socialism contained several elements, including the country's industrialization, the collectivization of agriculture, or rather the formation of cooperatives in the uncollectivized sector of the economy, the implementation of a cultural revolution, and the solution of the nationalities question. Some of these tasks are resolved, for instance the creation of a mighty industrial potential for the country as the initial material and technical base. Lenin sought and largely found socialist forms of organizing economic life which, of course, are being enriched with time and becoming more developed and complex. Some of them may alter their appearance, but they have abiding value for us. This applies to Lenin's ideas for the development of economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and the use of a strict system for linking the degree of labor and the degree of consumption and state control over the degree of labor and consumption. When we use the entire system of material incentives and remuneration of labor, when we seek a way of combining economic levers, financial levers, and money turnover with the advantages of planned methods, I believe that we are proceeding along the path of the ideas in Lenin's plan. With, of course, a consideration for the new dimensions of the economy and its new tasks and approaches. The same may be said of Lenin's idea of a tax in kind as one of the most brilliant ideas in economic science. This is a theoretical prototype, the methodological basis for modern economic methods of economic management.

[Denisov] Sometimes the current restructuring is compared with the New Economic Policy [NEP] and NEP, it is claimed, meant elements of capitalism in socialism...

[Abalkin] I am indeed often asked this question during my public appearances. It is also typical of foreign journalists and scientists.

One must clearly differentiate between two aspects of the new economic policy. NEP was a retreat, a concession to the economy of private capital with a consideration for its experience in organizing production and its potential for finding a way out of the crisis at that time. With time (above all since the "Brief Course on the History of the All-Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks"), this aspect of NEP became perhaps the dominant one in our consciousness. As a rule it was stressed that NEP was a policy aimed at the toleration of capitalism, at the struggle between socialism and capitalism, and, finally, at the definitive victory of socialism over capitalism and the ousting of the latter. But that is only one, historically transient, aspect of NEP.

The NEP also contained a second element -- a means of training people in socialist methods of economic management. The point is that the policy of wartime communism, the methods of economic management under the conditions of a beseiged fortress, could never be essentially economic. So NEP was a transition from enforced methods of socialist economic management to normal ones... Incidentally, few people draw attention to the fact that the transition to the NEP coincided with the creation of Gosplan. In his well-known letter to Krzhizhanovskiy Lenin wrote that the NEP did not mean a deviation from a single state economic plan and did not exceed its framework but only altered the methods of its implementation. NEP is connected with the broad introduction of economic accountability, with the transition from food requisitioning to the tax in kind, from administrative to economic methods of regulating relations between the state and the peasant farm, from distribution based on leveling down to distribution with the aid of money turnover, with the aid of its laws of supply and demand.

And I also want to say that, in comparing events separated by decades, one may be captive to superficial analogies. Today's economy and the economy of the twenties differ fundamentally. What was 1921 like? We had only just emerged from the civil war, the country was in ruins, factories were standing idle, the land was not being cultivated, in Russia there was hunger, virtually no industry of its own, the mass of the country was only semiliterate, there were no cadres for the economy and no experience of planning. And take today's economy, the gigantic potential created over decades, the highly skilled cadres, the colossal experience with all its pluses and minuses, errors and achievements. An utterly new situation -- with a high standard of living and incomes, tremendous market saturation with goods, even if the goods are not in demand and not up to date, these are still not the times when there was not a meter of cotton textile to be had... That is why I have refrained from drawing a direct analogy. If we are speaking of comparability then it is in terms of the dimension of transformations, the depth of restructuring, and the fact that today as then we must restructure the entire mechanism from top to bottom and not simply improve methods but replace them with fundamentally new ones. A fundamental restructuring is also needed in people's awareness. People shouted to Vladimir Ilich Lenin from the auditorium: We weren't taught how to trade in the prisons!... Today too there are opinions being expressed against economic accountability and commodity-money relations.

[Denisov] Will we not lose some advantages of the planned system by restructuring Gosplan and transferring some of its functions to enterprises and local organs?

[Abalkin] There are advantages to the planned management of the economy and there is a specific historical type of organization of planned work. [paragraph continues]

The present system took shape at some point in the thirties and for decades the advantages of the planned management of the economy were realized exclusively through the direct, specific setting of targets, the detailed listing of plan indicators, and the establishment from above of everything right down to the petty details of what to produce, how to produce it, who to supply it to, and so forth. And gradually the concept of the planned management of the economy and the specific historical countenance of planning merged in the public awareness and in part even in science. Restructuring provides not for the renunciation but essentially for the consolidation of planned principles in the economy, the return to planning of much which it has lost -- in particular a strategic vision, the solution of major national economic problems, and the pursuit of a structural policy.

But the methods of planning work, its specific countenance, the means with whose aid statewide targets, state plan tasks, and structural transformations are brought to their specific executors, are changing fundamentally. The advantages of the planned management of the economy lie not in bureaucratic regimentation but in the scientifically substantiated, economically expedient, and socially effective solution of strategic tasks, the formation of the national economy's integral structure and internal proportions. It is this aspect of centralized planning which is becoming the main one. Our planning organs, overburdened with petty concerns and day to day measures, have had neither the time, nor the opportunity, nor the inclination, nor, recently, the experience to resolve truly large-scale strategic national economic problems. So in restructuring planning we are proceeding along the path of consolidating socialism.

[Denisov] N. Shmelev's article "Advance Payments and Debts" claims that the market should become the main economic regulator.

[Abalkin] First I should like to explain the nature of my reply. In the broad debates, in the collective quest for the answers to the questions which life has set, no specialist has the right to claim the absolute truth. What I am about to say reflects my understanding of the question. I think that going to extremes is often characteristic of debate today.

The shortcomings which took shape in the previous system of planning and its bureaucratization are no reason for dashing toward haphazard development. There are things which the market in principle cannot regulate. Current demand, the rapid change of market forces, the restructuring of production in line with changing requirements are one thing and phenomena of a strategic nature, radically new avenues in science and technology, and fundamental transformations in the economy are another. Today the economy must be not inert but mobile, flexible, variable, and structural changes should be accomplished rapidly in it. It is these problems which in principle cannot be regulated by the market. Incidentally, all world practice proves this. The pure market, the market in the classical sense, no longer exists in any country, as was the case in the 19th century. Pinning one's hopes on the market is experiencing nostalgia for times gone by, to which there is no return. In addition it seems to me that we frequently lack methodological standards. You cannot argue on the "either or" principle and assert that anything beyond it is redundant. Life is always dialectic, and we must learn this approach. I can recall how Lenin wrote that socialism and trade are seemingly incompatible things but, he continued, all life and all experience of the revolution teaches us to combine opposites. I believe that today too we must think about the future in a balanced and considered way without allowing new extremes which could be no less pernicious than the old distortions.

[Denisov] Socialism guarantees people many advantages and protects them from possible economic upheavals and unemployment. A person is confident that tomorrow he will have something come what may. [paragraph continues]

But economic accountability and the autonomy of enterprises probably presuppose the possibility that they will go bankrupt. How in that case should we understand social guarantees?

[Abalkin] Any benefit continued beyond its natural boundaries results in negative phenomena. The social guarantees inherent in socialism are indeed an enormous advantage of our system. But when we begin to present all benefits as being virtually gifts and man as being somehow graced by the state, then there arise dependence, the desire to obtain more than is commensurate with the expenditure of one's own labor. Leveling down in distribution was widespread: Since everyone received from the state, from its bounty, each person laid claim to a more or less equal share. Naturally, this model of parasitical consumerist socialism, even of parasitical socialism (without fear of exaggeration I shall say that it developed widely in both theory and practice) does not accord with the true nature of our system.

But at the same time we cannot rush in the opposite direction, completely rejecting social guarantees. Every citizen in our society has the right to count on the state being concerned to ensure that he has a minimum housing provision, that in old age he has a guaranteed income saving him from helplessness and from dependence on other people, even his own children. Every person has the right to count on the guarantee of secondary education, irrespective of the material situation of secondary education, irrespective of the material situation of his parents, and on living in a particular republic, oblast, city, or villages. Every person should have the guaranteed right to obtain work in accordance with his speciality and society must plan the creation of enterprises and new work places in such a way that any person can find an application for his efforts... But, I repeat, this is a minimum social provision. Every person must know that his real situation and the entire volume of material and even spiritual benefits which he possesses and the opportunities for revealing his abilities and organizing his time and leisure rationally will depend primarily on the results of his labor. Of course, differentiation in the remuneration of labor should be stepped up with the introduction of economic accountability. Some people will receive more and some less than they have done so far. Because much of what he used to receive was not earned. After all there is a mass of examples of output being produced which society does not need and which does not enjoy any demand. This applies both to consumer goods and the means of production.... In brief, a person does not have the right to count on obtaining the same amount if he continues to work listlessly, as before. And that is right, that is the socialist way. And the more fully we implement the principle of economic accountability and the differentiation of incomes and strengthen the unity of the degree of labor and reward, the more socialism and the more justice there will be.

[Denisov] Nonetheless, is the bankruptcy of enterprises possible under conditions of economic accountability? Will it not lead within certain limits to the appearance of unemployment? It is N. Shmelev again who believes that yes, it will lead to unemployment, and believes that this "is a very good specific against laziness" and a lever stronger than "any economic accountability."

[Abalkin] I do not think that you have to use the word "bankruptcy." Closure, or the liquidation of loss-making enterprises is better. After all, loss making is a phenomenon alien to the nature of the socialist economy. If there are hopelessly sick enterprises which are essentially living off society, living at the expense of other people's labor, and if no measures can help, then the enterprise must be liquidated and closed and its property must naturally be sold. That also benefits socialism.

As for the workers, I have already said that a person should have the opportunity to obtain work in accordance with his speciality if his old job has proved unnecessary. There should be a state system for redistributing and retraining cadres and compensating them for a period of temporary inactivity. For instance, an enterprise is liquidated but for some time a person should have a guaranteed income until he acquires a new speciality and finds work.

Now about the mobile reserves for redistributing manpower which the article "Advance Payments and Debts" calls unemployment. In life there are no rigid schemes whereby leaving work and going to work coincide to the day. We should not try to designate very complex social processes with a single scathing word. Unemployment is a social phenomenon reflecting the economic system's inability to ensure the full rational employment of the population. In that strict sense unemployment and socialism are incompatible things. The fact that the movement of manpower resources -- and with a turnover of something like 10 percent that means 12 million people a year -- creates complexities is another matter. A system should be formed which would oblige a person to respect his work place, to hold on to it, not out of fear of losing it but because his work place is provided with modern equipment, is connected with a high standard, with the intellectualization of labor, with a favorable sociopsychological climate in the collective. In brief, a person should treasure the conditions of his work. The guarantee of employment and the guarantee of the right to a specific workplace are different concepts. No one guarantees a person that work place, he must earn it on a competitive basis or by other means. Of course, a person may lose a place, but he cannot find himself unnecessary to society. He will merely be faced with the need of engaging in a less attractive form of activity, with lower wages and a less pleasant atmosphere. That is entirely normal. And society must have a mobile reserve of manpower to switch it to key salients. This path is compatible with the overall system of a planned economy and, moreover, is one of the conditions of its effectiveness.

[Denisov] In other words, great personal competitiveness is appearing?

[Abalkin] I personally do not like that word. I prefer to use the term "contest" or "rivalry," or the broad use of competition principles. And this concerns not only leaders, when we chose one man from several, and not only admissions to a department or institute. I think this approach will also be applied increasingly widely at work places. Take the Kirov fishing kolkhoz in Estonia -- there is a waiting list there for people anxious to become members of the farm. That is also an element of competition, precisely because of the kolkhoz's special opportunities -- a fine organization of labor, high productivity, and the high standard of production and of the entire life of the labor collective. So this phenomenon fully fits into the modern model of our economic life and ideas about socialism.

[Denisov] Now many enterprises and entire sectors are switching to full economic accountability and at the same time the old administrative system of management has been retained. What should we most fear in the transitional period? Should we accelerate the introduction of economic accountability or is there some point in getting some experience first?

[Abalkin] I believe that we must be realists, that we should not build illusions but be clearly aware that the transitional period, which covers the next 3 years, will be extraordinarily complex in the country's economic development. It will not lead to immediate successes. New approaches must gather momentum and be accelerated and end with the formation of an integral system. The expected effect will only be obtained at the end. That is why I would say that wht we must fear above all is unjustified illusions, unfounded expectations and hasty pessimistic conclusions and disappointments. And that inevitably follows unjustified illusions. We must prepare for sustained and persistent work.

Incidentally, this year the enterprises of five industrial ministries working with full economic accountability and self-financing often have worse indicators than they had before and smaller growth indicators than in other sectors which have not been switched to the new conditions. Here there are also grounds for hastily construing that the new system is ineffective. But that is inevitable in the period when a structure is being broken.

I will mention one more danger -- the danger of deviating from the intended model. The June plenum outlined the ideology and philosophy of the new system of management. It is very important to implement it in specific resolutions, documents, and decisions and not to lose the unified line, not to deviate, not to abandon principles for the sake of some individual decisions or individual advantages.

As for speed of movement, I would like to wait and to accumulate experience. But the best teacher is life and practice and that is why it is only after it has actively joined in it that a labor collective feels the strength of the new methods, the weight of responsibility, and the power of full economic accountability. This cannot be studied from books or mastered with the aid of slogans, it comes only through personal experience. That is why the point of the transitional period lies precisely in the fact that experience will be assimilated and real economic management under conditions of economic accountability and learning from one's own mistakes will begin. All this will also pave the way into the future. So there are many difficulties and dangers but, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put it very well at the plenum, the biggest error is the fear of making an error.

[Denisov] In your view, what should economic science be like today? Obviously, it must also help to avoid errors?

[Ablakin] A golden age of flowering and quest is coming for economic science. And an age of supreme responsibility. I would highlight two of its functions. One is to notice in time the emergence of new shoots and phenomena, including negative phenomena, and to give prompt recommendations and forecasts. The operational-tactical functions of science, so to speak.

But the formation of new theoretical views is even more important and complex. We now have a greater need of the renewal of the theoretical front, the theoretical foundation of the political economy of socialism. Without a foundation the entire edifice will be precarious. Radical, fundamental breakthroughs are needed to new theoretical generalizations, to a new view of our entire economic system, to a new understanding of ownership. In our country it is amazingly simplified and smooth and we often fail to see complex problems. Here is just one issue which we are now considering very seriously, where not everything is clear to science. It is a case of the combination of the interests of society, the collective, and the worker. On the tactical plane of the problem is not complex. There is pure profit, profit, or the economically accountable income of the collective. I define growth on a normative basis, deduct 30 percent for the budget for the state, and the more economically accountable income or profit there is, the more the budget receives. Society is interested in ensuring that profit in the collective grows and the collective is interested in ensuring that each worker receives his share from this effect; a more or less optimum harmonization of interests. On this plane a solution to the problem would seen to have been found.

But there are current and short-term interests and there are long-term interests. The collective receives broad autonomy. Equipment can be renewed and quality improved and this will produce some "surface fat" every year, some increases in revenue -- 3, 5, or 10 percent. But the need has arisen for a fundamental retooling and not with equipment that is mostly new but with equipment that is fundamentally new. To create it, to assimilate it, to "squeeze" an effect from it we need, let's say, 10 years. But the collective has all the rights, it decided where to invest money -- in measures for the running renewal of production or fundamental technical modernization which in 10 years' time will result in a multiple gain for you and for society. But some people in the collective will retire on pension in a year or two, the leader is soon to be reelected, and cadres turnover is 10 percent; that is, there will be a complete renewal of cadres in 10 years. How in that case to find the proprietor's interest -- an interest inherent in socialism -- in the future economic effect? How to combine short-term interest and long-term interest? Where is the yardstick for the sacrifices which must be undertaken today to obtain a profit tomorrow? There is no simple solution to this question. It is clear that only someone who has indeed felt himself to be the proprietor can act correctly. It is not simply the collective as an amalgam of individuals, but also as a kind of social community with its own tradition and concern for the future and for future generations. That means that new economic and social forms of community, a system of traditions, a link between the generations, and much else that we have forgotten must be formed. We used to think there was a centralized leadership which sees and knows everything and resolves these questions for us in a paternalistic way.

In brief, there is a mass of problems here. How to ensure that we do not distort the essence of our principles, how to really make man such that he perceives himself as the vitally interested, true proprietor today and forever? It is necessary to form some kind of new theoretical concept also connected with life, with practice, but raising us to an utterly new way of considering it.

[Denisov] Today the leaders of enterprises, the middle leading echelon, are as a rule specialists: engineers, designers, technicians, ship builders, metallurgical workers, miners... They have minimal economic knowledge and some do not have any at all. How can we teach all workers right now and administer under conditions of economic accountability?

[Abalkin] My answer may sound excessively categorical and sharp but for people to learn to work under conditions of economic accountability they must be put...under conditions of economic accountability. That is the main thing. There is no better teacher than life. You cannot learn economic accountability, economic methods, the ability to use credit, banking relations, and the consideration of consumer demand from a book... This is also in part the answer to the other questions we were talking about. We cannot put things off and wait until everyone "has learned economic accountability." We must set to work, put people into the new conditions, and then they will rapidly restructure themselves. Of course, we must also consider here that a decision has been taken on the widespread instruction of modern economics.

I also frequently repeat that we are impeded by inertia, that we have become accustomed to what is old, that this is a very grave legacy and when, I say, will this mentality change?... But after a television program recently I suddenly wondered: But is there not a very simple answer here? It was an evening with Arkadiy Raykin. And in response to a remark about how slowly man's mentality changes, replied: What do you mean, it changes very rapidly. So, he said, when I am driving my automobile and there are pedestrians on every side I think: Have they gone mad, can't they see I'm driving? Where are they going? But I only have to be deprived of my automobile and to be sent to walk down the street for my mentality to be changed instantly: This time I am walking down the street and there are automobiles rushing about on every side. Where are they rushing, where are they going, can't they see that we humans are walking down the street?.. Without oversimplifying the problem, I want nonetheless to say that people's thinking and mentality changes with the change in their social status and situation.

Previously too we used to engage a great deal in economic propaganda and many books were written, some of them quite good, but I still put the change in conditions in first place. Incidentally, this dilemma concerned Marx and he answered it. The well-known "Theses on Feuerbach" cites this argument: Objective circumstances change people's consciousness, but people's consciousness also changes objective circumstances. According to Feuerbach the result is a vicious circle. Marx says: But the solution of the problem lies in revolutionary practice which contains both principles -- the changing of people and the changing of objective circumstances. So revolutionary restructuring is the means whereby we must combine the changing of people and their consciousness and preparedness with the changing of objective conditions. Without separating what we say we will first teach people and, when we teach it, will begin to apply in practice the next day. That cannot be and will not be. But we cannot introduce economic accountability without accompanying each step with an additional step in another field, including economic retraining. The first experience already exists: The Academy of the National Economy has already held a course of study for students who are general directors of associations. This course has met with a positive assessment and we will use it.

EQUIPMENT SHORTFALLS HAMPER HARVESTING WORK

PM201435 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Jul 87 p 1

["Agricultural Review" by N. Osychkin: "Harvesting Without Delay"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] According to USSR Central Statistical Administration figures 3.5 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been harvested by 13 July. Some 2.5 million hectares had been threshed, of which 943,000 hectares were threshed last week. [passage omitted]

A total of 931,000 hectares of grain have been harvested in the RSFSR. More than 40 percent of it has been threshed. Harvesting has now reached the Don and the southern Central Chernozem Zone, where they are getting ready to gather it in. The farmers of Belgorod Oblast have fitted their combines with attachments suitable for cutting lodged grain. Hoppers and other units have been carefully sealed, and all chief and straw will also be collected.

In the Ukraine harvesting units are out in the fields of the Crimean, Kherson, Odessa, Nikolayev, and Transcarpathian Oblasts. Crops there have been slow to develop and have lodged in a number of rayons. Machine operators are doing everything possible to prevent losses.

Well-prepared equipment and efficient use of that equipment would serve to speed up the harvest and ensure that all the crop is harvested. Unfortunately, the news here is not good. According to the USSR Central Statistical Administration, across the country as a whole only 89 percent of combines were in good working order at the beginning of July. This is somewhat below the figure at the beginning of last year's harvesting season. Some 80,000 of these machines still have to be repaired. One-fifth of all combines in Kurgan, Perm, and Kostroma Oblasts are not ready for operation. Some 20 percent of windrow harvesters cannot be taken out into the fields through lack of repair -- which naturally slows down the harvesting. Repairs are being delayed not only by poor labor organization but by an acute shortage of spare parts, especially gearboxes, variable-speed drives, conveyor belts, and pickups. When will the agricultural workers of the "Rostelmash" Production Association, the Tula Combine Plant, the Krasnoyarsk Combine Production Association, and the Berdyanskiy Reaper Production Association finally make up their backlog? Because idle machines increase the workload on those machines that are operating, which prolongs the harvesting and produces losses.

Nor can we omit to mention a major oversight on the part of the leaders of the ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building. They gave many assurances that the quality of harvesting equipment produced by them would improve. But what did those assurances amount to in practice? Kolkhozes and sovkhozes refused to buy 17,000 new combines mainly as a result of technical defects. This despite a high average workload per unit!

The sad fate of the Don-1500 combines, which were for the first time to play an extensive role in harvesting, is particularly disturbing. According to the plan 3,000 of these powerful vehicles were to have been delivered for this season. By the end of June 2,597 of them had been shipped to local agricultural supply depots. But it turns out that only Rostov Agricultural Machine Building Plant units can be put into operation. The rest were delivered without reapers or attachments suitable for harvesting sunflowers and hulled and other crops and with numerous technical defects. According to the design the Don-1500 should have a 7-meter reaper, but there is no trace of it. As replacement the Tula plant involved offers a 6-meter version. [paragraph continues]

But in Poltava Oblast, for example, only 12 units have been received for... 72 combines. The situation in Kharkov, Belgorod, and other oblasts is no better. Given this, the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee has been forced to stop accepting Don-1500 combines until the previously delivered machines are fully equipped. This is surely a slap in the face to the ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building Ministry, which has prevented an important state target from being achieved.

A busy time lies ahead for the vegetable plantations and orchards. The vegetable conveyor belt has started up in Astrakhan Oblast, the Don, the Ukraine, and in Moldavia. The first 2 million tonnes of vegetables have been procured. Some 850,000 tonnes of early potatoes have been purchased. But, unfortunately, interruptions are occurring in the production and sale of fruit and vegetable output. The range of fruit and vegetables in Uzbekistan is inadequate. Freightcars containing perishable produce often lie idle for whole days in stations and depots in the Moscow region waiting to be unloaded. Enterprises involved in processing green peas in Moldavia have proved to be inadequately prepared.

The main task facing agro-industrial complex workers now is to make use of everything that is grown in the fields, orchards, and truck farms and adequately meet the population's food requirements.

CSA REPORTS HARVESTING FIGURES FOR 20 JULY

LD230614 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Jul 87

[Text] The country's farms are stepping up the harvesting rates. According to USSR Central Statistical Administration data for 20 July, grain has been reaped from almost 9 million hectares of fields. Over the last week the harvesting moved toward the southern boundaries of the Non-Chernozem Zone. It covered farms in RSFSR oblast with vast areas sown with grain. The state of crops in most areas is good.

It is vital to gather the harvest without loss and to deliver it to the procurement center or elevator more quickly. At the same time as the harvest is in progress feed crops are being laid in. This circumstances puts greater responsibility on the farms for precise organization of the entire harvesting operation. The laying in of the feed crops is better organized than at the initial period of the session and last year.

More hay has been gathered than last year, 44.3 million tonnes. That is 52 percent of the plan. Forty-nine million tonnes of haylage have been made and 7.4 million tonnes of silage. Unfortunately, when it comes to the quality of hay, for example, things are not what we would like them to be everywhere. Little first-class hay is made on many farms in the Non-Chernozem and some other regions as well. This occurs because modern machines and equipment are disregarded, and there is little forked ventilation of grass.

RADAR UNIT'S 'SHODDY WORK' CRITICIZED

PM211041 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jul 87 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Rodionov article: "No Right to Make Mistakes"]

[Text] The following incident occurred quite recently in one of our electronics subunits. The operator "read off" the target information on the display unit, but the plotter transferred it inaccurately to the map board. Senior Lieutenant A. Petrov, who was in charge of the work, did not check the accuracy of the incoming information and it was relayed up the line to the command post. True, the situation in the air was relatively straightforward at the time and, although the mistake introduced confusion and alarmed the duty detachment, it was quickly revealed and corrected. Nonetheless, the consequences of such a mistake could have been more serious.

Here is another example. An operator once conveyed information to a command post about the sudden appearance of a target. But, to put it mildly, the command post did not treat the information seriously. The target was proceeding against a backdrop of complex contours. This produced additional clutter on the screen and the blip itself was weak. It then disappeared altogether, and, as a consequence, the duty officer put it down to a flock of birds. Yet it turned out to be a crop-spraying aircraft that had strayed off course owing to a malfunction in its navigation equipment.

These are two examples. Two types of shoddy work. But, as is well known, shoddy work in our business is fraught with major consequences. Everything must be done to prevent it. First and foremost by means of painstaking and constant concern to train combat detachments and to foster a heightened frontline awareness and responsibility in people. After all, it transpired that both the aforementioned mistakes were the result of people's inadequate professional training: of the plotter soldier in the first instance, and of the duty officer in the second. Such things do not happen where personnel training is approached with high responsibility and where people are well aware how high the price of similar mistakes could be.

The servicemen at the electronics battalion commanded by Lieutenant Colonel G. Kormilyev perform their combat standby duty vigilantly and reliably, first and foremost because they have been well trained to do so. The following detail is worth noting. Be it a planned exercise, drill, or training session, they always have an innate spirit of creativity and seek methods to produce the greatest effect in their training. A commander or chief of staff could suddenly appear at a training session conducted by any officer and load his own unexpected program into the simulator. Competitions in the knowledge, servicing, and use of the equipment are held here and, for instance, commanders vie for the best exercise scenario for their subordinates. All this is reflected to a considerable extent in the training, organization, and vigilance of the servicemen during their combat standby duty.

A different picture is presented in the subunit commanded by Major I. Popovichev. Often things that the commander should do himself with regard to the organization of combat training he delegates to other officers, who redelegate the work to warrant officers and sergeants. Inadequate demandingness is shown in the subunit toward engineering and technical staff for the condition of equipment and the training and education of specialists. This leads to unreliability in the stations' work, breakdowns, and mistakes by specialists....

Training centers have a good effect on the personnel's professional training. Their advantage is that servicemen are able to train at them under conditions that approximate as closely as possible those encountered on combat standby duty -- provided, of course, the training center is led by an experienced officer well acquainted with training methods, such as Major V. Untevskikh, for instance. He does not let a single person leave the training center without completing the set program. However, not all training center chiefs cope as responsibly with the duties assigned to them, sometimes because of inadquate personal preparation. Such people also must be taken into account, and we are taking the necessary measures in this respect.

It also sometimes happens that one analyzes a mistake and concludes that a specialist was only indirectly to blame. For instance, can an operator alone be blamed for everything if he had been working with a double or even triple workload for an impermissibly long time? Why not? It is elementary: There is nobody to relieve him. Rookies may have come to the unit straight from a training subunit and cannot be allowed near the equipment. They have not studied it for long and, naturally, have a poor knowledge of it. Many need additional training in some areas, or even retraining. Yet the personnel roster indicates that the subunit has a full complement of specialists. Incidentally, I think that the actual staffing structure of radar units needs improvement. The following experiment was carried out at the unit where the aforementioned Maj V. Untevskikh serves. Teams were drawn up in such a way as to ensure that each man's workload did not exceed scientifically substantiated norms, so to speak. Their work was then checked in various scenarios and conditions. The result? Information was neither distorted nor overlooked and there were no breakdowns in the work.

The training of students at military colleges -- a problem that has generated many conversations and discussions but is still being inadequately resolved -- needs to be substantially improved. Many graduating lieutenants arrive professionally and psychologically unprepared for commanding units and platoons or for teaching and educating people. In particular, Lieutenants R. Khromyshkin, V. Dmitriyenko, and S. Afanasyev -- graduates of the Krasnoyarsk Higher Command Air Defense Electronics College -- arrived unprepared in this way. But they could hardly be sent back to college to brush up their studies. So we taught them ourselves, along with other training subunit graduates. Of course, further training is always necessary in practice. But not to the same extent!

In short, many problems start being solved when one seeks an answer to why a certain mistake was made. Needless to say, we must solve our problems: We bear direct responsibility for this. Yet the greatest result in this serious matter will be obtained when everyone starts working conscientiously in their assigned area.